



✓
UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

ANNALS
OF
ARCHAEOLOGY
AND
ANTHROPOLOGY

ISSUED BY THE
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

EDITED BY
J. P. DROOP
AND
A. M. BLACKMAN

VOL. XXVII
MCMXL

27
1940

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS OF LIVERPOOL

CONTENTS

Hittite Prayers of Mursili II. O. R. GURNEY :—

	PAGE
Preface	4
Abbreviations	5
Introduction	8
Text and Translation	16
Commentary	40
Excursus	120
Concordance	125
Index	129
Reviews	164

EDITORS' NOTE

The Institute of Archaeology has suffered a great loss through the death of Miss Mabel Ratcliffe, who held the post of secretary there from 1932 till the end of June of this year. She was a most competent secretary and librarian, and under her able direction the Institute's books and more valuable antiquities were moved from 11 Abercromby Square to the greater security of the Harold Cohen Library in September and October 1939. That she was a first-class draughtswoman must be obvious to anyone who has studied the plates illustrating Professor Garstang's reports in this journal for the last six years.

She will be greatly missed at the Institute, not only by the staff but by the numerous students who make use of its library and collections of antiquities.

HITTITE PRAYERS OF MURSILI II

BY

O. R. GURNEY

PREFACE

THIS edition of the four texts published in *KUB XXIV 1-4* was undertaken at the suggestion of the late Professor Ehelolf (Berlin). In the winter of 1935-6 I had the privilege of attending Professor Ehelolf's lectures, in which the texts were discussed in outline and several difficult points were elucidated; and I have also been able to discuss the work with him privately at a later stage. Many particular suggestions and ideas which I owe to him are acknowledged in their place. But his instruction and criticism have stimulated the work throughout, and for these I here record my gratitude. I am also indebted to him for permission to make use of a number of unpublished texts.

My thanks are also due to Dr. Leonie Zuntz for much helpful criticism; to Professor John Garstang for his constant support and encouragement; and finally to the Board of Management of the Griffith Institute and to the Committee for Advanced Studies of Oxford University, whose generosity, despite the difficulties of the present time, has made possible the publication of this work.

O. R. G.

BOARS' HILL,
OXFORD,
June 1940.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AJSL*=*The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*. Chicago.
- AKF*=*Archiv für Keilschriftforschung* (=first 2 vols. of *AOF*).
- Al.*=Alakšanduš treaty; Friedrich, *Vert.* no. 5.
- AOF*=*Archiv für Orientforschung*. Berlin.
- AOr.*=*Archiv Orientalni*. Prague.
- Bechtel, *Hittite Verbs*=G. Bechtel, *Hittite Verbs in -sk-, A Study in Verbal Aspect*. Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1936.
- Berl. Mus. Ber.*=*Berliner Museen, Berichte aus den Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* (Beiblatt zum Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen).
- Boissier, *MBMH*=A. Boissier, *Mantique Babylonienne et Mantique Hittite*. Paris, 1935.
- BoSt.*=*Boghazköi-Studien*, 10 parts. Leipzig, 1917-24.
- BoTU*=*Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift*, von E. Forrer,=*Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft*, nos. 41 and 42. Leipzig, 1922-6.
- Couvreur, *Hett. h*=W. Couvreur, *De Hettitische h=Philologische Studien, Teksten- en Verhandelingenreeks*, Nummer 12. Leuven, 1935.
- Deimel, *ŠL*=P. Anton Deimel, *Šumerisches Lexikon*. Rome, 1928-37.
- Dupp.*=Duppi-Tešup treaty, Friedrich, *Vert.* no. 1.
- Ebeling, *Quellen*=E. Ebeling, *Quellen zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion*,=*MVAG* 23. Leipzig, 1918.
- Forrer, *Forsch.*=E. Forrer, *Forschungen*. Berlin, 1926-.
- Friedrich, *Vert.*=J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in Hethitischer Sprache*, 2 parts,=*MVAG* 31.1 and 34.1. Leipzig, 1926-30.
- Götze, *AM*=A. Götze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*,=*MVAG* 38. Leipzig, 1933.
- Götze, *Hatt.*=A. Götze, *Hattušiliš*,=*MVAG* 29.3. Leipzig, 1925.
- Götze, *Kultur.*=*Kulturgeschichte des alten Orients* (=Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von W. Otto, dritte Abteilung, erster Teil, dritter Band), dritter Abschnitt, erste Lieferung: A. Götze, *Kleinasiens*. Munich, 1933.
- Götze, *Madd.*=A. Götze, *Maddunvattaš*=*MVAG* 32.1. Leipzig, 1928.
- Götze, *NBr.*=A. Götze, *Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Texte des Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexten*,=*MVAG* 34.5. Leipzig, 1930.
- Götze-Pedersen, *MS*=A. Götze and H. Pedersen, *Muršiliš Sprachlähmung*,=*Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-Filologiske Meddelelser* XXI, 1. Copenhagen, 1934.

- Hatt.*=the great text of *Hattusilis*. See Götze, *Hatt.* and *NBr.*
- Hirt Festschr.*=*Germanen und Indogermanen, Festschrift für H. Hirt*, herausgegeben von H. Arntz. Heidelberg, 1936.
- Hrozný, CH*=F. Hrozný, *Code Hittite provenant de l'Asie Mineure, première partie*,= *Hethitica* I. Paris, 1922.
- HT*=L. W. King, *Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from tablets in the British Museum*. London, 1920.
- Hukk.*=Hukkanaš treaty, Friedrich, *Vert.* no. 6.
- IF*=*Indogermanische Forschungen*. Berlin and Leipzig.
- JAOS*=*Journal of the American Oriental Society*. New Haven.
- JRAS*=*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. London.
- JSOR*=*Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*. Chicago.
- KBo.*=*Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, 6 parts,= *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft*, nos. 30 and 36. Leipzig, 1921-3.
- KlF.*=*Kleinasiatische Forschungen*. Weimar.
- KUB*=*Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, published by the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Vorderasiatische Abteilung. 1921-(38). (The parts of this series, at present 29, are usually referred to by Roman numerals only; the abbreviation *KUB* is only inserted if references to other series precede.)
- Kup.*=The Kupanta-KAL treaty, Friedrich, *Vert.* no. 3.
- Lang.*=*Language*, Journal of the Linguistic Society of America. Baltimore.
- LSS*=*Leipziger Semitische Studien*.
- Madd.*=The Madduwattaš text, *KUB* XIV 1. See Götze, *Madd.*
- MAG*=*Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft*. Leipzig.
- Man.*=Manapa-Dattaš treaty, Friedrich, *Vert.* no. 4.
- MDOG*=*Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft*. Leipzig.
- Mél. Cum.*=*Mélanges Franz Cumont*,= *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, tome IV. Brussels, 1936.
- Mél. Ped.*=*Mélanges Holger Pedersen*,= *Acta Jutlandica* IX 1. Copenhagen, 1937.
- Mil.*=the Milawata letter,=Sommer, *AU* no. 3.
- MVAG*=*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch - Ägyptischen Gesellschaft*. Leipzig.
- OECT*=*Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts (Inscriptions)*. Oxford.
- OLZ*=*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*. Leipzig.
- RA*=*Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale*. Paris.
- Real. Ass.*=*Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, herausgegeben von E. Ebeling und B. Meissner. Berlin and Leipzig, 1928- .
- Real. Vorg.*=*Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, herausgegeben von M. Ebert. 1924-32.

- REAn.*=*Revue des Etudes Anciennes*,= *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux et des Universités du Midi*, quatrième série. Bordeaux.
- RHA*=*Revue Hittite et Asianique*, organe de la Société des études Hittites et Asianiques. Paris, 1930- .
- Sommer, *AU*=F. Sommer, *Die Ahhijavā-Urkunden*,= *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Abteilung*, NF 6. Munich, 1932.
- Sommer, *HAB*=F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *Die Hethitisch-Akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I (Labarna II)*= *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Abteilung*, NF 16. Munich, 1938.
- Sturtevant, *Chrest.*=E. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy* (William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series). Philadelphia, 1935.
- Sturtevant, *HGl.*=E. Sturtevant, *A Hittite Glossary*, second edition (William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series). Philadelphia, 1936.
- Sturtevant, *HGr.*=E. Sturtevant, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language* (William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series). Philadelphia, 1933.
- Targ.*=Targašnalliš treaty, Friedrich, *Vert.* no. 2.
- Taw.*=the Tawagalawaš text (*KUB XIV 3*), Sommer, *AU* no. 1.
- Ungnad, *Subartu*=A. Ungnad, *Subartu, Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Völkerkunde Vorderasiens*. Leipzig, 1936.
- VAB*=*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*, 7 books. Leipzig, 1907-16.
- VBoT*=A. Götze, *Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte*. Marburg, 1930.
- Walther, *CH*=A. Walther, *The Hittite Code*,=J. M. Powis Smith, *The Origin and History of Hebrew Law*, Appendix IV. Chicago, 1931.
- Weidner, *Stud.*=E. Weidner, *Studien zur Hethitischen Sprachwissenschaft* 1,= *LSS* 7 1, 2. Leipzig, 1917.
- Witzel, *HKU*=P. Maurus Witzel, *Hethitische Keilschrift-Urkunden in Transcription und Uebersetzung mit Kommentar* 1,= *Keilinschriftliche Studien* 4. Fulda, 1924.
- WZKM*=*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*. Vienna.
- ZA*=*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Verwandte Gebiete*. Berlin & Leipzig.
- ZDMG*=*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. Leipzig.
- Zuntz, *Ortsadv.*=Leonie Zuntz, *Die hethitischen Ortsadverbien arḫa, parā, piran als selbständige Adverbien und in ihrer Verbindung mit Nomina und Verba*, Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät (1. Sektion) der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München. 1936.
- Zuntz, *TIS*=L. Zuntz, *Un Testo Ittita di Scongiuri*,= *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti*, Tomo XCVI, parte seconda, pp. 477-546. Venice, 1937.

INTRODUCTION

DESCRIPTION OF THE TEXTS

THE four tablets Bo. 2415, Bo. 2082, Bo. 2034, and Bo. 2605¹ were published in 1930 from excellent copies by A. Walther as the first four numbers of *KUB XXIV*, their close relationship having long been recognized; and no. 4 has since been supplemented by the fragment Bo. 3556, which joins Bo. 2605, virtually completing lines 16-24 of the obverse and 5-15 of the reverse—a discovery due to Professor Ehelolf. These four texts are here referred to as A, B, C, and D (the letter D thus denoting Bo. 2605+Bo. 3556). Each is essentially a separate work; but they are so closely related that a separate edition of each would be superfluous. A composite text has therefore been made, but on account of the complicated relationship of the originals, this has necessitated a certain rearrangement of the contents.

A and B differ only in that A contains a colophon which is lacking in B. Hence, though only the beginning of the obverse and the end of the reverse are preserved on B, it is probable that A and B were duplicate copies of a single text. This is a prayer addressed by Mursili II to the deity Telipinu, whom we know from other sources to have been a vegetation god, perhaps identified by the Hittites with Tammuz.² It consists of an invocation of the god, describing the care which is bestowed upon his cult in the Land of Hatti in contrast to other countries, and a prayer entreating him to drive forth 'fever, plague, famine and locusts' into the lands of enemies, and to grant prosperity to Hatti and long life, happiness, etc., to its royal family. There are several examples of this type of prayer in Hittite; it seems to have been specially associated with the verb *mugā*.³

D is a quite distinct composition, not contained in A+B, addressed to 'the gods' in general, and closely resembling the 'plague prayers' edited by Götze in *KlF*. I 161-251. These were special prayers written

1. 'Bo' (=Boğazköy) is the symbol used for all tablets excavated by H. Winckler in 1906-11 and belonging to the Museum of Istanbul.

2. See Götze, *Kultur*. 134 f.

3. See pp. 41 ff.

on the occasion of the pestilence or epidemic—the nature of the disease cannot be determined—which was apparently introduced by certain Egyptian prisoners captured by Suppiluliuma at the end of his reign, claimed his son and successor Arnuwanda as one of its first victims, and continued to devastate the land of Hatti during the early years of Mursili II. In all of them, and particularly in the present text, the fearless rationalism of Hittite religion is very striking. It is pointed out that the pestilence which the gods have brought upon the land is entirely against their own interests, for it merely results in the death of the temple servants and the consequent neglect of the sacrifices. It is emphasized (to prevent any misunderstanding) that it is the gods themselves, not the Hittites, who are responsible for this neglect. Their attention is also drawn to the impious behaviour of the surrounding lands and even of certain rebellious vassal kingdoms, and they are thus besought—in their own interests—to take vengeance on these countries by transferring the affliction to them. The prayer concludes with a remarkable passage reminiscent of Abraham's intercession for the life of Lot in Genesis xviii. 23 ff.

A fragment of another duplicate of this section, 2156/g,¹ has come to light in the excavations of 1937, and has been used to restore C II 3-16.

In C these two literary types are combined, the plague prayer being inserted in the middle of a prayer closely resembling the text of A+B, but addressed to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, that patroness of kingship and of the Hittite state who figures so prominently in the royal archives and is probably represented by the leader of the procession of goddesses in the rock-sculptures of Yazilikaya.² In fact C and A+B are (apart from the difference in the deity addressed) duplicates down to the point where A breaks off (A II 22=C I 31). C here continues with a hymn of praise, unparalleled in the Hittite archives, of which translations have already been published by Ehelolf,³ Forrer,⁴ and Götze.⁵ It is true that the first few lines of this hymn are also preserved on A before the break in the text. But this raises a problem, for the language used in C is obviously influenced strongly by the Babylonian conception of

1. Since the excavations were reopened in 1931, the tablets have been catalogued thus, letters of the alphabet being used to indicate the year in which they were found.

2. Original discovery of the Sun-goddess by Winckler, *MDOG* 1907 53; cf. also Garstang, *LAAA* 6 (1914) 109 ff. See now Götze, *Kultur*. 128 ff.

3. *Berl. Mus. Ber.* 49 (1928) 32-34.

4. *Real. Ass.* I (1929) 149 ff.

5. *Kultur*. 128.

Shamash and marks the passage as a typical solar hymn—note the emphasis on justice, the circuit of heaven and earth, the allotting of portions, and the mention of the opening of the gate of heaven. Such ideas have their parallels in numerous Accadian and Sumerian prayers to Shamash of the types *šu-il-la* and *ki-dUtu-kam*,¹ but they are quite foreign to the conception of a vegetation deity. Therefore if A contained this hymn, as the opening lines suggest, the current view of the nature of Telipinu must be revised: it may be that he also had solar attributes, and that his Tammuz character was adventitious, as in the case of so many Sumerian and Accadian deities.² On the other hand, the lines preserved on A are of a general nature, and it is possible that A had different words from C in the lines that followed.

This hymn, well suited though it is for a solar deity, was evidently not originally composed for the Sun-goddess of Arinna, since in lines 35 and 47 she has the masculine attribute *EN-aš* 'lord' and never her usual title *GAŠAN*. The explanation suggested by Ehelolf in his translation and by Walther in the foreword to *KUB XXIV*, that the hymn belonged primarily to the cult of Telipinu, is, as we have seen, unlikely; nor does Ehelolf's alternative suggestion, that it was written for any major deity whatever, seem very probable, on account of its peculiarly solar characteristics. Walther's alternative explanation, that the masculine titles have been taken over from an Accadian hymn to Shamash, is more plausible; in fact Accadian influence is so strong that it seems at first sight as if the hymn may be actually a translation from the Accadian. But in spite of the Accadian parallels already pointed out, there are at least two conceptions which are peculiarly Hittite, namely, the idea of *parā hantantātar* and the 'Ancient Gods' of the Underworld: see commentary, pp. 76 f. and 81 f.

Hence the only satisfactory explanation seems to be that the hymn was written for the Hittite Sun-god Istanu; and indeed this is proved by several parallel texts from recent excavations in which the name *DUTU-uš* (in one text *DUTU-e*) actually takes the place of *DUTU URUArinna*.³ The Sun-god is not so prominent in the texts as his

1. Shamash as judge, *passim*: 'Shamash light of heaven and earth, splendour of the lands,' *OECT* VI 82 3 (other passages cited by Weir, *Lex.* 253): allotting of portions, Ebeling, *Quellen* 35 32: opening of gate of heaven, e.g. *OECT* VI 52 3 ff., Ebeling, *ibid.* 35 30.

2. See Witzel, *Analecta Orientalia* 10.

3. See commentary, p. 83.

female counterpart. But it is to him that the two short passages translated by Tenner in *KlF.* I 387 ff.—the only Hittite texts at all comparable to the present hymn—are addressed, and we there find the same Accadian influence, in particular the judicial functions of the god,¹ as here. Moreover, Tenner has also shown that the double conception of the sun as a god of heaven on the one hand and of the underworld on the other—a notable characteristic of the present hymn—belongs to this Hittite Sun-god.² The occurrence of the phrase URUTÚL-na-aš DUTU-uš in XXVIII 6 obv. 12 suggests that here—and perhaps elsewhere—DUTU URU *Arinna* may be the Sun-god and not the Sun-goddess. But XXVIII 6 is a proto-Hittite text in which DUTU-uš is apparently used to translate the name *yu_u-ru-še-mu*, and since the Sun-god is not elsewhere connected with *Arinna*, it would be unsafe to base such an assumption on this isolated text.

The hymn occupies the remainder of the first column of C, *i.e.* some 35 lines. In A about 10 lines are lost at the end of col. II and about 8 at the beginning of col. III. Thus there is a lacuna of about 18 lines, after which the text continues for 15 lines with a prayer to Telipinu to grant the royal family long life and happiness. There follow two lines requesting the expulsion of fever, plague, famine and locusts from Hatti, corresponding to the 'plague prayer' which occupies the whole of col. II of C. At this point C col. III began (the first few lines are broken), but from here onwards the texts, though similar, are far from identical, and the colophons are entirely different.

The comparison of the texts thus provides a further reason for supposing that A diverged from C soon after the break which occurs in A at the beginning of the hymn of praise. For the lines of A are actually somewhat shorter than those of C, and it is therefore impossible that the whole of the hymn should have been contained in the 18 lines that are missing from A; yet the first 15 lines of A III have no connexion with the hymn. It is probable therefore that in place of the lengthy hymn in C, A had a short passage in praise of Telipinu followed by a prayer for blessing.

For the purposes of this edition the texts have been arranged in four sections. Section I is the introductory invocation which is the same on A, B and C; section II contains (*a*) what is left of the hymn

1. Tenner, *loc. cit.*, p. 390.

2. Tenner, *ZA.* NF. IV 186-90. Cf. Götze, *Kultur.* 129 f.

of praise in A, together with the first 17 lines of col. III (lines 16-17, which perhaps belong strictly to section III, have been included here for the convenience of the reader), and (b) the hymn of praise as preserved on C; section III is the 'plague prayer'; and the remainder of the texts of A+B and C have been edited separately to form section IV. It must be emphasized that this arrangement is artificial. A and B are essentially unities, and it is clear from the last four lines of C, where the speaker turns his address again from the Sun-goddess to 'the gods,' that the author of that tablet intended the 'plague prayer' to form an integral part of his work. The arrangement in sections results from the more or less accidental survival of precisely these four tablets, their state of preservation, and the necessity of editing them in a convenient way.

The contents of each text may be tabulated as follows:—

A+B:	sections I, II a and IV a.
C:	„ I, II b, III and IV b.
D:	section III.
2156/g:	„ III (only a few lines preserved).

THE DATE OF THE TEXTS

It cannot be assumed that these four tablets, similar though they are, were all written at the same time. As regards C and D the clue to the date is given by the historical passage C II 25 ff.=D I 16 ff. There Mittanni and Arzawa—and in D also Kizzuwatna—are grouped together as *kuriyana*-lands, in contrast to Gasga, Arāwanna, Kalasma, Lukka and Pitassa, which are described as Hatti-lands, and all are said to be in rebellion against Mursili. This can only be at the beginning of the reign. In the introduction to the Annals of his first ten years (*KBo.* III 4 I 3-29) the king describes this revolt, and relates how he prayed to the Sun-goddess of Arinna: 'Sun-goddess of Arinna, my queen! The surrounding enemy-lands, which have called me a child and scorned me and have repeatedly tried to seize thy territories, O Sun-goddess of Arinna, my queen—come down to me, O Sun-goddess of Arinna, my queen, and slay those surrounding enemy-lands before me' (23-26, see Götze, *AM* 20-23)—words which recall those used in this prayer. These Annals then go on to describe how the countries were subdued one by one, first the Gasga lands (years 1-2), then Arzawa (years 3-5), then

further Gasga lands including Arawanna (years 5-7), then Azzi-Hayaša, chiefly through the general Nuwanza (years 8-10), and finally North Syria (year 9). The subjugation of Kalasma follows in *KBo.* V 8 col. IV (years 22 according to Götze, perhaps earlier). (Neither Lukka nor Pitassa is mentioned by Mursili; Mittanni occurs only in connexion with his father.)

Forrer (*KlF.* I 266³) infers from the omission of Kizzuwatna in C that C represents a later edition of the prayer, which was repeated again after the subjugation of Kizzuwatna but before that of Arzawa. Now Kizzuwatna is mentioned in *KBo.* III 4 IV 22, and Götze in *ZA.* NF. II 306 ff. deduces from the corresponding section of the 'complete annals' that this refers to North Syria which the king had just conquered. Forrer, however, for whom Kizzuwatna=Pontus, takes *KBo.* III 4 IV 22 as referring to the Invocation Festival at Kummanni-Kizzuwatna, which is mentioned earlier in the Complete Annals, and supposes that K. was conquered by a general in the first two years of the reign, since the Annals make no mention of the campaign and it must fall before the conquest of Arzawa.¹ This is not the place to add anything further to the already considerable literature on Kizzuwatna; I have, however, the impression that the weight of evidence is against Forrer's view. But if Kizzuwatna=Syria, then it was conquered after Arzawa, and its omission here is due to a different recension of the text and is of no historical importance. Note that C omits a whole clause between 29 and 30 for no apparent reason.²

Thus C and D are dated to the beginning of the reign. A and B differ, among other things, in omitting the whole of the plague prayer, which includes the historical section, and in associating the queen and the princes (who seem to be everywhere omitted in C) with the king in the prayer for blessing, etc.: see commentary on B I 4. This is capable of an historical explanation on the assumption that A and B were written several years after C and D. For we know that at the beginning of the reign the queen (*tawannannas* and *SAL.LUGAL*) was the widow of Suppiluliuma and that she quarrelled so violently with her son Mursili that he was obliged to expel her from the palace and

1. Forrer, *loc. cit.*, and *Forsch.* II 38.

2. It is possible that D is earlier than C and that Kizzuwatna was omitted in C because the Hittites decided it was not strictly a *kuriyana*-land. This hypothesis would be supported if Kizzuwatna in D were erased, as asserted by Götze, *Madd.* 141; but that is apparently not the case.

so to become the cause of her death—a *cause célèbre* which we still find weighing on the conscience of Mursili's son Ḫattusili.¹ We do not know the date of her death, but it would be not unnatural in these circumstances for the king to postpone the inclusion of the queen in the official prayers until that dignity had descended upon his own wife. And by that time we may well suppose that the plague had ceased to be a matter of general concern.

On the other hand, the inclusion of the queen and the princes may be of no significance whatever; and indeed the composite nature of C presupposes that a text very similar to A+B was already in existence before C was composed. That A and B were also written at the beginning of the reign is therefore not unlikely, but it cannot be said to be proved, owing to the considerable differences between them and C, especially in section IV.²

TECHNICAL POINTS

For each section the best text has been taken as the basis for the transcription and translation, and all variants have been entered in the footnotes.

The method of transcription followed is mainly that of Sommer, Friedrich, Götze and Ehelolf. Accadian words are printed in italic capitals; for all other signs used as ideograms the correct Sumerian reading according to the sense is given, so far as it is known; all determinatives are printed above the line. This is the method by which the majority of texts have been transcribed and is on the whole the most satisfactory, even though Forrer's system of transcribing Sumerian ideograms by their commonest value, regardless of the correct Sumerian reading, has the advantage of avoiding little-known values and numerous homonyms.

The following details should be noted:—

1. I follow Götze (*AM* 13) with regard to the use of hyphens and points, and the plural elements MEŠ and ḪI.A. Points are used to connect the component parts of Sumerian ideograms, hyphens between the syllables of Accadian words. The plural elements are printed above the line only after Hittite or Accadian words; after Sumerian words

1. *KUB* XIV 7 and XXI 19. On the whole affair see Forrer, *Forsch.* II 1 ff., and *Real. Ass.* I 54; Sommer, *AU* 300 ff.; and Cavaignac, *RHA* II 157-9.

2. Cf. commentary, p. 119.

they form part of a single homogeneous ideogram, and are therefore printed on the line.

2. Numerals are transcribed in the Roman manner.

3. Accadian phonetic complements are printed on the line, in the same way as those which are Hittite.

4. Square brackets indicate a break in the text. If the lost words are preserved in a duplicate, they are inserted in round brackets within the square brackets. If not, and no restoration is suggested, the approximate number of signs (where this can be estimated) is indicated by dots, two for each sign. The source of any suggested restoration is recorded in a footnote, unless it is obvious from the context. In the translation the approximate length of a lacuna is indicated, but the dots have no precise significance.

5. The translation has been made as literal as possible; where a freer translation has been made the literal translation has been added in a footnote. Words have sometimes had to be transferred from one line to another owing to the difference in the order of words in the English sentence.

6. The sign $><$ is inserted where the tablet is broken but the context gives reason to suppose that there is no lacuna in the text.

7. In the commentary a summary of the work of German scholars on matters of more general interest has sometimes been given instead of a mere reference, for the benefit of English readers.

THE TEXT

SECTION I: INVOCATION

A and B to Telipinu; C to Sun-goddess of Arinna

- B I 1 [ki-i-k]án² tup-pi! 'DUP.SAR A-NA DINGIR-LIM an-da
UD-at UD-at me-mi-iš-[i-iz-zi²]
2 [nu? DIN]GIR-LAM ya-al-li-iš-ki-iz-zi
-
- 3 ^DTe-li-pi-nu-uš šar-ku-uš na-ak-ki-iš DINGIR-uš³ zi-ik
4 u-i-ja-at-mu ^IMur-ši-i-li LUGAL-uš tu-e-el ÌR-KA SAL.
LUGAL-aš-ša
5 tu-e-el ĞÌM-KA u-i-e-ir i-it-ya ^DTe-li-pi-nu-un
6 an-zi-el EN-NI DINGIR-LAM ŠA SAG.DU-NI mu-ga-a-i
-
- 7 nu-za-kán ma-a-an na-ak-ki-iš ^DTe-li-pi-nu-uš še-ir ne-pi-ši
8 DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na ma-a-an a-ru-ni na-aš-ma A-NA
HUR.SAG.MEŠ
9 ya-ḥa-an-na pa¹-a-an-za na-aš-ma-za I-NA KUR LÚKÚR
za-aḥ-ḥi-ja pa-a-an-za
-
- 10 ki-nu-na-at-ta ša-ne-iz-zi-iš ya-ar-šu-la-aš ĞIŠERIN-an-za
ÌĀ-an-za
11 kal-li-iš-du na-aš-ta EGIR-pa⁴ ^Eka-ri-im-ni-it-ti⁵ an-da e-[ḥ]u
12 nu-ut-ta ka-a-ša mu-ki-iš-ki-mi NINDAḥar-ši-it DUGiš-pa-an-du-
uz⁷-zi-it
13 nu-uš-ša-an pa-ra-a ka-la-a-an-kán⁸-za e-eš nu-ut-ta ku-it
14 me-mi-iš-ki-mi nu-mu DINGIR-LUM iš-ta-ma-na-an la-ga-a-
an har-ak na-at i[š-(ta-ma-aš-ki)]
-
- 15 zi-ik-za ^DTe-li-pi-nu-uš na-ak-ki-iš DINGIR-LIM-iš nu-ut-ta
DINGIR-LIM-ÌĀ

1. The first nine lines are not preserved on C; therefore we cannot tell whether the name of the Sun-goddess was in these lines (as elsewhere) merely substituted for that of Telipinu or whether the text was different.

2. Restored from treaty-formulae, e.g. *Kup.*, § 30, J 1.

3. A I 3: DINGIR-LIM-iš.

4. Here begins C I 2.

TRANSLATION

SECTION I : INVOCATION

A and B to Telipinu ; C to Sun-goddess of Arinna ¹

- B I 1 The scribe rea[ds this] tablet to the deity every day,
2 [and?] praises the deity.

-
- 3 O Telipinu,¹ a mighty (and) honoured god art thou.
4 Mursili the king, thy servant, has sent me, and the queen
5 thy handmaid, they have sent (saying) : ' Go ! Telipinu ¹
6 our lord, our personal god, entreat.'
-

- 7 Now if, O honoured Telipinu,¹ thou art up in heaven
8 among the gods ; if thou art gone to the sea or to the
mountains
9 for hunting (?), or art gone into the enemy's country to battle,
-

- 10 now let the exquisite refreshment (arising) from cedar
(and) oil
11 invite thee ; and come back again into thy temple.⁶
12 Behold now, I am entreating thee with (offerings of) food
(and) drink ;
13 be thou fully nourished ; and what I say unto thee—
14 hold thine ear inclined to me ⁹ and hear it.
-

- 15 Thou, O Telipinu, art an honoured god, and to thee, O my god,
-

5. A omits *-it-ti* ; C has *Éka-ri-im-m[a?]*.

6. A omits ' thy ' ; C broken.

7. A I 14 omits.

8. C I 4 : *-ga-an-*.

9. See commentary.

- B I 16 Û É.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ I-NA KUR URUḪa-at¹-ti-pit²
*ta-aš-nu-ya-an*³ *nam-ma-ma-at*⁴-t[a]
 17 [t]a-m[e]-e-da-ni KUR-e⁶ Ū-UL ku-ya-pi-ik-ki e-eš-zi
 18 [(nu-ut-ta E)]ZEN.ḪI.A SISKUR.SISKUR.ḪI.A⁸ I-NA
 KUR URUḪa-at-ti-pit⁹ pár-ku-i
 19 [(šu-up-pi¹⁰ pi-iš¹¹-kán)]-zi nam-ma-ma-at⁴-ta ta¹²-me-e-da-ni
 20 [KUR-e¹⁴ (Ū-UL ku-ya-pi-ik)]-ki pi-iš¹¹-kán-zi

- A I 25 É.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ-ta pár-ku IŠ-T[(U KUBABBAR
 GUŠKIN ú¹-nu¹-ya¹-an¹-ta¹)]
 26 I-NA KUR URUḪa-at-ti-pi[(t e-eš-zi nam-ma-ma-at-ta)]
 27 ta-me-e-da-ni K[UR-e Ū(-UL ku-ya-pi-ik-ki e-eš-zi)]
 II 1 [GAL¹⁵]ḪI.A-ta BI-IB-RIḪI.A KUBABBAR GUŠKIN!
 NA₄[(ḪI.A)]
 2 I-NA KUR URUḪa-at¹⁶-ti-pit¹⁷ e-eš-zi

- 3 EZEN.ḪI.A-it-ta EZEN ITU EZEN.ḪI.A MU-aš¹ me-e-a-
*na-aš*¹⁸
 4 gi-im-ma-an-ta-aš ḫa-mi-iš-ḫa-an-da-aš²⁰
 5 zé-na-an-da-aš²⁰ a-ú-li-uš mu-ki-iš-na-aš-ša
 6 EZEN.MEŠ²¹ I-NA KUR URUḪa-at²²-ti-pit e-eš-zi²³
 7 nam-ma-ma-at-ta ta-me-e-da-ni KUR-e¹ Ū-UL
 8 ku-ya-pi-ik-ki e-eš-ša-an-zi
 9 n[(u t)]u-el Š[(A)] DTe-li-pi-nu²⁵ DINGIR.MEŠ-tar²⁶ I[(-NA
 KUR URUḪa-at-ti-pit)]
 10 [(na-ak-ki-ja-aḫ-h)]a-an nu-ut-ták-kán IMur-ši[-i-li²⁸ (LUGAL-
 uš IR-KA)]

1. A I 19: Ḫa[t-], C I 7: KUBABBAR.
2. A (? cf. 22) and C omit -pit.
3. A I 20: da-aš-ša-nu-ya-an; C I 7: ta-aš-ša-nu-ya-an.
4. A omits -at-.
5. 'Alone' (=pit) omitted by duplicates.
6. A I 20 ud-ni[-e]. C here inserts E DINGIR-LIM-KA.
7. C adds 'temple of thine.'
8. A I 22 omits ḪI.A. C I 9 adds -ja.
9. A I 22 Ḫa-ti (omits -pit). C broken.
10. Traces in C I 10 suggest that C omitted this word; cf. also C I 25.
11. C -eš-.
12. A dam-.
13. Probably omitted by C.
14. A I 24 ud-ni-e.

- B I 16 there are also in the land of Ḫatti alone ⁵ strongly-built
temples; nay
17 in another country nowhere [*sic*!] is there (any).⁷
18 And in the land of Ḫatti alone ⁵ festivals and sacrifices pure

19 and holy ¹³ they present to thee; nay in another
20 country nowhere do they present them.

- A I 25 To thee there are lofty temples adorned with silver and gold

26 in the land of Ḫatti alone; nay
27 in another country nowhere is there any.
II 1 For thee there are [bowls ¹⁵] (and) rhyta, silver, gold (and)
(precious) stones
2 only in the land of Ḫatti.

- 3 They celebrate ¹⁹ festivals for thee—the festival of the month,
the festivals of the half-year (?),
4 of the winter, of the spring,
5 and of the autumn, and the festivals of the sacrificial
animals (?) and of the supplication—
6 only in the land of Ḫatti;
7 nay in another country nowhere
8 do they celebrate them for thee.
9 And thy divinity, Telipinu,²⁷ in the land of Ḫatti alone

10 is honoured, and Mursili the king, thy servant,

15. Restored from B II 6. Cf. also XVII 21 I 11 ff.
16. C I 16 KUBABBAR.
17. Last legible word in B I.
18. C I 16 MU-TI *mi-i-ja-na-aš*.
19. So C. A has 'there are' (lit. 'there is'). But see commentary.
20. C I 17 transposes these words, and has *ḫa-me-eš-ḫa-an-da-aš*.
21. C I 18 ḪI.A.
22. C I 18 KUBABBAR.
23. Written over erasure. C I 19 *e-eš-ḫa-an-zi*. See commentary.
24. Text KUR.URU.
25. C DUTU URU.A-ri-in-na. In previous lines the name is broken away.
26. C I 21 DINGIR-LIM-*ja-tar*.
27. Lit. 'of thee, of Telipinu.' O 'Sun-goddess of Arinna.'
28. C I 21 ¹*Mur-ši-DINGIR-LIM-iš*, but cf. B I 4.

- A II 11 [SAL.LUGAL-*aš-ša* GÌM-KA] Û DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL¹
 1̄[R.MEŠ-KA]
 12 [(I-NA KUR URU²*Ha-at* ²*ti-p*)]*it* [(*na-aḥ-ḥa-an*)-*te-eš*³ (*nu*
tu-el)]
 13 [(ŠA D*Te-li-p*)]*i-nu*⁴ [(*ḥi-im-mu-uš* SISKUR.SISKUR.ḪI.A
 EZEN.ḪI.A)]
 14 [(*i-ia-u-ya-an-z*)]*i ša-ra-a* [(*ti-it-ta-nu-uš-ká*)]*n-z*[(*i*)]
 15 [(*nu-ut-ta ḥu*)]-*u-ma-an šu-up-p*[*i*⁶ (*pár-ku-i p*)]*i-iš*⁷-*kán-zi*
 16 [(*nam-ma-aš-ša*)]-*an É* DINGIR-LIM-KA [*BI-IB-R*]*I*⁸ ḪI.A-
 KA⁹
 17 [GAL.ḪI.A-KA]⁸ *Ú-NU-TE*MEŠ-KA⁹ *na-aḥ-ša-ra-za*¹⁰ *ti-*
ia-an-za
 18 [*na¹-at¹*] EGIR-*pa kap-pu-ya-an A-NA Ú-NU-*
*UT*¹¹
 19 [. ¹² (*ma-ni*-)]*in-ku-ya-an Ú-UL ku-iš-ki ti-ia-az-zi*

SECTION II: HYMN OF PRAISE AND PRAYER FOR BLESSING

(a) A [and B] to Telipinu (greater part lost)¹³

- A II 20 [*zi-ik-za* D*Te-l*]-*i-pi-nu-uš na-ak-ki-iš* DINGIR-LIM-*iš*
 21 [*nu-ut-ták-kán* ŠUM-*jan* ŠUM.ḪI.A-*aš iš-tar-na-aš na-ak-ki-i*
 22 [DINGIR.MEŠ-*tar-ma-ták-kán*]¹⁴ DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš i[š]-ta[r-*
n]a na-a[k-ki-i]

Remainder of column (about 10 lines) lost.

III Beginning of column (about 8 lines) lost.

- 1 [.] DUMU².M[*EŠ*².LUGAL² . . .
 2 [*Ú A-NA KUR URU²Ha-at-t*]*i an-da aš-šu-l*[*i ne-iš-ḥu-ut*¹⁴]
 3 [. D*Te-l*]-*i-pi-nu-uš šar-ku-uš* DINGIR-[LIM-
iš ><]
 4 [LUGAL SAL.LUGAL DUMU.ME]Š.LUGAL¹⁵ TI-*an ḥar-ak*
nu-uš-ma-aš

1. C omits these words; hence restorations conjectural.

2. C I 23 KUBABBAR.

3. C I 23 *na-aḥ-ḥa-an-za* (subj. LUGAL only).4. C DUTU URU²*A-ri-in-na*. In previous lines the name is broken away.

5. Lit. 'of thee, of Telipinu.' C 'Sun-goddess of Arinna.'

6. C I 25 omits this word.

7. C I 26 -*eš*..

8. Restore from A II 1, B II 6 and C III 2.

- A II 11 [the queen, thy handmaid], and the princes ¹ [thy] s[ervants]
 12 revere thee only in the land of Ḫatti. And the celebration
 of thy
 13 feasts (?) sacrifices (and) festivals, Telipinu,⁵
 14 they continually carry out (?),
 15 and everything they present to thee holy ⁶ (and) pure.
 16 Moreover, to thy temple, thy [rhyta] ^{8, 9}
 17 [thy bowls] ^{8, 9} (and) thy utensils ⁹ reverence is paid
 18 [and they are *carefully*] counted over ; [and] to the utensils ¹¹
 19 [of] no-one draws near.

SECTION II : HYMN OF PRAISE AND PRAYER FOR BLESSING

(a) A [and B] to Telipinu (greater part lost) ¹³

- A II 20 [Thou, Tel]ipinu, art an honoured god ;
 21 [thy nam]e is honoured among names,
 22 [and thy divinity] is honou[red] am[on]g the gods.

Remainder of column (about 10 lines) lost.

III Beginning of column (about 8 lines) lost.

- 1 [. to] the son[s] of the king (?)
 2 [and to the land of Ḫatt]i [turn for] blessing.
 3 [. Tel]ipinu, lofty god [><]
 4 keep in life [the king, the queen, and the prin]ces,¹⁵ and

9. C omits these words, but adds *A-NA KUBABBAR GUŠKIN* 'to the silver and gold.'

10. C I 27 -*az*.

11. C omits this line.

12. C I 28 + *nu*.

13. For restorations see section II b.

14. Restored from A II 9.

15. Restoration conjectural.

- A III 5 [TI-tar ŠA EGI]R¹ UD-MI *ha-ad-du-la-tar* MU.KAM.ĤI.A
GID.DA
6 [in-na-ra-ya-tar²] pi-eš-ki nu-uš-ma-aš-kán A-NA ZI-ŠU-NU
an-da
7 [>< la-lu-u]k-ki-ma-an du-uš-ga-ra-da-an-na
8 [zi-ik-ki ><]
-
- 9 [nu-uš-ma-]aš [IB]ILA.MEŠ DUMU.SAL.MEŠ *ha-aš-šu-uš*
ha-an-za-šu-uš pi-eš-ki
10 [nu-u]š-ma-aš nu-ú-un tu-um-ma-an-ti-ia-an pi-eš-ki
11 [n]u-uš-ma-aš *hal-ki-ia-aš* GIŠGEŠTIN-aš ŠA GUD UDU
12 DUMU.LÚ.GÁL.LU-ia mi-i-ia-ta pi-eš-ki
13 nu-uš-ma-aš LÚ-aš tar-*hu-u-i-li-in* pa-ra-a ne-*í*[a-an-ta-an]³
14 D GIŠTUKUL-in pi-eš-ki nu-uš-ma-aš KUR.KUR LÚKÚR
15 ŠA-PAL⁴ ĠIR.MEŠ-ŠU-NU zi-ik-ki na-at in[-na-ra-a *har-*
ga-nu-ya-an-du]⁵
-
- 16 IŠ-TU KUR URU*Ha-at-ti-ma-kán i-da-lu-un ta-[pa-aš-ša-an]*⁶
17 *hi-in-kan ka-aš-ta-an kar¹-ša-an-na a[r-ha u-i-ia]*⁷
-

(b) C to Sun-goddess of Arinna⁸

- C I 29 zi-ik-za DUTU URU*A-ri-in-na na-ak-ki-iš* DINGIR-LIM-iš
30 nu-ut-ták-kán ŠUM-an lam-na-aš iš-tar-na na-ak-ki-i
DINGIR-LIM-ia-tar-ma-ták-kán
31 DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na na-ak-*kí-i* nam-ma-za-kán
DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na
32 zi-ik-pit DUTU URU*A-ri-in-na na-ak-ki-iš šal-li-eš-ša-az*
33 zi-ik-pit DUTU URU*A-ri-in-na nam-ma-ták-kán da-ma-a-iš*
DINGIR-LUM
34 na-ak-ki-iš šal-li-iš-ša Ú-UL e-eš-zi *ha-an-ta-an-da-ša-az*
35 [*há-a*]n-ni-eš-na-aš EN-aš zi-ik-pit ne-pí-ša-aš-ša
36 [ták-na-a]š-ša LUGAL-u-iz-na-tar zi-ik-pit du-ud-du-uš-ki-ši
37 [KUR.KUR.M]EŠ-a[š-]kán ZAG.ĤI.A-uš zi-ik-pit zi-ik-ki-ši
38 [mu-g]a-u-ya-ar-ra zi-ik-pit iš-ta-ma-aš-ki-ši
-

1. Restored from C III 17 ff.

2. Restored from A IV 10 + B II 12.

3. Restored from XV 34 II 22.

4. Followed by erasures.

5. Restoration suggested by Bo. 2073 I 36 (KlF. I 301).

A III 5 grant them [life, fu]ture health, long years,

6 [and manliness (?)], and in their hearts

7-8 [put war]mth (??) and joy.

9 [And] grant them [so]ns, daughters, grandsons (and) great-grandsons,

10 [and] grant them

11 and of crops, of vines, of oxen, of sheep,

12 and of men grant them fertility ;

13 and grant them a man's valiant unsh[eathed (?)]

14 weapon ; the lands of the enemy

15 put beneath their feet, and [may they destroy] them [in] w[rath (?)].

16 But from the land of Hatti [drive] f[orth] the evil f[ever] ⁶

17 plague famine and locust (?).

(b) C to Sun-goddess of Arinna ⁸

C I 29 Thou, Sun-goddess of Arinna, art an honoured deity ⁸ ;

30 and thy name is honoured among names. Thy divinity

31 is honoured among the gods ; nay, among the gods

32 thou alone, O Sun-goddess of Arinna, art honoured. Great also

33 art thou alone, O Sun-goddess of Arinna ; nay, compared with thee no other deity

34 is honoured and great. Of sure (?)

35 judgement thou art lord, ⁸ and kingship in ⁹ heaven

36 and [earth] thou controllest (?).

37 Thou settest the boundaries of the [lands] ;

38 and it is thou that hearest the prayer.

6. Restored from C III 9, etc. Here begins B II.

7. Restored from *KLF*. I 214 7.

8. The Sun of Arinna is a goddess, but throughout this section her attributes are masculine : see introduction, p. 10.

9. Lit. ' of.'

- C I 39 [zi-i]k-pit-za DUTU URU A-ri-in-na gi-in-zu-ya-la-aš
DINGIR-LUM zi-ik
40 [nu] gi-in-zu zi-ik-pit da-aš-ki-ši pa-ra-a ha-an-da-an-za-ša-kán
41 a[n-t]u-uh-ya-aš-ha-aš tu-uk-pit A-NA DUTU URU A-ri-in-na
aš-ši-ja-an-za
42 na-an zi-ik-pit DUTU URU A-ri-in-na [ša]r-li-eš-ki-ši
43 ne-pi-ša-aš-ša-az ták-na-aš-ša hu-u-la-li-eš-ni
44 zi-ik-pit DUTU URU A-ri-in-na la-lu-uk-ki-[m]a-aš
45 KUR.KUR.ĤI.A-ša-za-kán iš-tar-na zi-ik-pit aš-ša[-nu-ú]a-
an-za DINGIR-LIM-iš
46 nu-za KUR-e-aš hu-u-ma-an-da-aš at-ta-aš an-na-aš zi-ik
47 ha-an-ni-eš-na-ša-az pa-ra-a ha-an-da-an-za EN-aš zi-ik
48 nu-ut-ta ha-an-ni-eš-na-aš pi-di tar-ri-ja-aš-ha-aš NU.GÁL
49 ka-ru-ú-i-li-ja-ša-za-kán DINGIR.MEŠ-aš iš-tar-na zi-ik-pit
50 aš-ša-nu-ya-an-za DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš-ša-aš-ša-an SISKUR.
SISKUR.ĤI.A zi-ik-pit
51 DUTU URU A-ri-in-na zi-ik-ki-ši ka-ru-ú-i-li-ja-ša-aš-ša-an
52 DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš ĤA.LA-ŠU-NU zi-ik-pit zi-ik-ki-ši
53 [ne-p]i-ša-aš-ša-aš GIŠGÁL EGIR-pa tu-uk-pit ha-aš-kán-zi
54 [nu-za-ká]n [n]e-p[i-ša-a]š KÁ-uš zi-ik-pit aš-ša-nu-ya-an-za
55 [DUTU URU A-ri-in-na ša]r-ri-iš-ki-it-ta ne-pi-ša-aš-ša
56 [. tu-u]k-pit A-NA DUTU URU A-ri-in-na
57 [.] . . . DUTU URU A-ri-in-
na me-mi-eš-ki-ši
58 [. DUTU URU A-ri-i]n-na
a-ru-ú-i'-iš'-kán' < -zi' >

Remainder (about 5 lines) lost.

SECTION III : PLAGUE PRAYER

C and D only. To the Gods ¹

- C II About 10 lines missing. [ud-da-a-ar-ma-mu]
1 ku-e [A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ ² Û A-NA] D¹UTU¹ URU¹A[-ri-
in-na KA×U-az]
2 pa-ra-a i'[-ja-at-ta-ri] na-at iš-[ta-ma-aš-ten] ³

1. Except 1-2 and 38-53, on which see commentary.

2. Or šu-ma-a-aš.

C I 39 Thou, O Sun-goddess of Arinna, a merciful god art thou,

40 [and] it is thou that takest pity. The uplifted

41 man is dear to thee, Sun-goddess of Arinna,

42 and thou, Sun-goddess of Arinna, [exal]test him.

43 Within the circuit of heaven and earth

44 thou, Sun-goddess of Arinna, art the (source of) warmth (??).

45 Among the lands thou art the deity whose cult is (most)
celebrated,

46 and thou art the father (and) mother of every land.

47 The inspired lord of justice art thou,

48 and in the place of justice thou art untiring.

49 Among the Ancient Gods thy cult is

50 celebrated, and to the gods the sacrifices thou,

51 O Sun-goddess of Arinna, allottest ; to the Ancient Gods also

52 thou allottest their portions.

53 To thee in return they open the door of heaven,

54-55 [and] thou, O celebrated [Sun-goddess of Arinna], dost pass
through the gate of [h]ea[ven] ; and the

56 [.] of heaven [to the]e, Sun-goddess of Arinna,

57 [.] . . O Sun-goddess of Arinna, thou
sayest,

58 [. O Sun-goddess of Arin]na, they bow
down.

Remainder (about 5 lines) lost.

SECTION III : PLAGUE PRAYER

C and D only. To the Gods ¹

C II About 10 lines missing.

[The words]

1 which [to (you) gods and] Sun-goddess of A[rinna] (?) [from
my mouth]

2 proc[eed], h[ear] them.

3. For the restoration of these two lines see commentary.

- C II 3 *ki-i* DINGIR.MEŠ [*ku-it i-ia*]-at-ten¹ nu *hi-in-kán* [*>< tar-na-at-ten*²]
- 4 nu KUR URUKUBAB[*BAR-ti hu-u-m*]-a-an-pít BA-UG₆ nam-m[*a-aš-ma-aš*³]
- 5 NINDA_{har-ši-in} [DUG_{iš-pa}]-an-du⁴-zi-ia Ū-UL *k[u-iš-ki]*
- 6 *i-ia-zi* LÚ.M[*ES?*APIN.LA]L⁵ A.ŠĀ A.QAR.ĪI.A DINGIR-LIM *ku-i[-e-eš]*⁶
- 7 an-ni-eš-kir na-a[t] e-kir nu nam-ma A-ŠĀ A.QA[R.ĪI.A DINGIR-LIM Ū-UL]⁷
- 8 a-ni-ia-an-zi ya-[a]r-aš-ša-an-zi Ū-UL *ku-[iš-ki]*⁶
- 9 SAL.MEŠ NA₄ARĀ ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ NINDA.KUR₄.RA.ĪI.A *ku-i-e-e[š e-eš-še-ir]*⁷
- 10 na-at-e-kir nu nam⁹-ma NINDA.KUR₄.RA¹⁰ Ū-UL [*i-ia-an-zi*]¹¹
- 11 UDU_{a-ú-li-ú-uš-kán} GUD.ĪI.A UDU.ĪI.A *h[(a-a-l)i-ia-az]*⁶
- 12 a-ša-u-na-az *ku-e-iz-za-aš kar-aš?-k[i-ir nu LÚ.MEŠSIPA.GUD]*⁷
- 13 LÚ.MEŠSIPA.UDU e-kir¹² ha-a-li-ia [*a-ša-a-u-ya-ar*¹³ . . .]¹¹
- 14 nu *ú-iz-zi A-NA* DINGIR.MEŠ NINDA.KU[(R₄.RA.ĪI.A DUG_{iš-pa-an-d})u-zi]¹⁴
- 15 UDU_{a-ú-li-uš-ša} kar-š[*a-an-ta-ri*¹⁵ >< (nu-un-na-aš)]
- 16 *ú-ya-at-te-ni*¹⁶ DINGIR.MEŠ a-pi-e[*da-ni-ia ud-da-ni*¹⁷]
- 17 ya-aš-du-li *har-te-ni*¹¹ na-aš-[*(a A-NA DUMU.LÚ.GÁL.LU)]*
- 18 ha-at-ta-tar¹⁹-šum-mi-it *har-ak[-ta]*⁶ (nu *ku-un-na-an ku-it i-ia-e-ni*)
- 19 na-at NU.GÁL¹¹ nu DINGIR.MEŠ *ku-it [(ya-aš-du-ul uš-ka-at-te-ni)]*
- 20 nu na-aš-šu DINGIR.MEŠ-ni-ia-an-za *ú-id[-du (na-at me-e-ma-a-ú)]*
- 21 na-aš-ma-at SAL.MEŠŠU.GI LÚ.MEŠAZ[U LÚ.MEŠMUŠEN.DÛ SI×DI-an-du]⁷
- 22 na-aš-ma-at za-aš-*hi*²⁰-ia-az DUMU.LÚ.GÁL.LU [(u-ya-an-du)]²¹

1. Restored from *KLF*, I 206 2 and 236 2.3. Restoration suggested by *KLF*, I 176 45.

5. Lit. 'the ordinary bread and the libation-vessel.' Cf. B I 12.

6. Restored from 2156/g.

8. Lit. : they [do not (?)] sow (or) reap--no[one].

10. 2156/g š[4] DINGIR.MEŠ NINDA.KUR₄.RA.ĪI.A.

2. Restored from 2156/g.

4. 2156/g tu.

6. Restoration conjectural.

7. First legible sign in D.

- C II 3 [What is] this, O Gods, [(that) you have d]one ? ¹ [You have
let in ² . . .] a plague,
4 and the land of H[ati—al]l of it—is dying, so

5 n[o-one] prepares the (offerings of) food and drink.⁵
6 The [farme]rs who used to sow the sacred fields

7 are dead, and so the [sacred] field[s]

8 no[-one] ⁶ sows (or) reaps.⁸
9 The women of the mill who [used to make] ⁷ the ordinary
bread of the Gods
10 are dead and so [they] do not [make] ⁷ the ordinary bread.¹¹

11-12 From whatever corral (or) sheepfold [they used to] select (?)
the sacrificial animals (?) oxen and sheep, [now the cow-
herds] ⁷
13 (and) shepherds are dead, and the corral [(and ?) sheep-
fold ⁶].¹¹
14 Now it is coming to pass (that) the foo[d and drink offerings]
to the gods
15 and the sacrificial animals (?) [are] negl[ected] ¹⁵. [And]
16 you come to us, O Gods, [and for] thi[s matter ⁶]
17 you hold (us ?) guilty ¹⁸, ¹¹; and from mankind
18 your wisdom [has ⁶] departed, and there is nothing that

19 we do aright (in your eyes).¹¹ Now, O Gods, whatever sin
you see,
20 either [let] a man of god come and declare it

21 or [let] the old wives, the seers, [(or) the augurs determine it]

22 or let men see it in a dream.¹¹

11. Division line in D and 2156/g.

13. Restored from 2156/g *a-ša-a-u-ū[a-*.

15. Restored from XIV 12 rev. 10.

17. Restored from 2156/g *a-pi-e-da-ni-ja ud[-*.19. D I 8 *ta*; 2156/g broken.12. D I 4 *a-ki-ir*; 2156/g *-k[i-ir*.14. 2156/g *DUGiṣ-pa-an-tu-uz-zi[-*.16. D I 6 *ú-ya-a-at-te-ni*.

18. Lit.: in guilt.

21. Division line in D.

- C II 23 *na-aš-ta* URUDZI.KIN.BAR-aš¹ GIŠšar-pa-az [(ku-un-ku)-
u-u-e-ni]²
- 24 *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ A-NA KUR URUKUBABBAR-ti³ gi-en-
z[(u nam-ma da)-at-ten]⁴
- 25 *ki-e-iz-za-at hi-in-ga*⁵ na-an-za ta-ma[(-a-aš-ta ki-e-iz)-za-at]
- 26 *ku*⁶ ru-ra-an-za ta-ma-aš-ta *nu* ku-ri-ya-na[(-aš KUR.KUR
TIM k)u⁷-(e⁸)]
- 27 *a-ra-aḫ-za*⁷ an-da⁴ KUR URUMi-it-ta-an-ni⁸ KUR URU
[(Ar-za-u-ya)]
- 28 *nu* hu-u-ma-an-za šu-ul-li-e-it nu-za-kán¹⁰ DI[(NGIR.MEŠ
ša-ra-a)]
- 29 Ū-UL i-ia-an-zi¹¹ na-aš-ta NI-EŠ¹² DINGIR.MEŠ šar-
r[i-in¹³]⁴
- D I 19 *nu* KUR URUHa-at-ti i-da-a-la-u-ya-an-ni ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zi¹⁴
- C II 30 É.ḪIA² DINGIR.MEŠ-ma¹⁶ la-u-ya-ar-ru-na ša-an-ḫi-iš-
kán-zi
- 31 na-at A-NA¹⁷ DINGIR.MEŠ¹⁸ kat-ta-ya-a¹⁷-tar nam-ma
ki¹⁹ ša-ru⁴
- 32 nu-uš-ša-an hi-in-kán ku²⁰ ru-ur ga-aš-ta-an²¹ i-da-a-lu-un²²
- 33 ta-pa-aš-ša-an²² A-NA KUR URUMi-it-ta-an-ni²³ Ū A-NA
KUR URUAr-za-u-ya
- 34 tar-na-at-ten^{25, 26} ya-ar-ša-an-da²⁷ šu-ul-la-an-da KUR.KUR.
ḪIA²⁸
- 35 (A-NA)²² KUR URUKUBABBAR²⁹ ti-ma ta-ri-ia³⁰ an KUR-e
- 36 nu ta-ri-ia-an-da-an la-a-at-ten ya-ar-ši-ia-an-da-an-ma³¹
- 37 tu-u³² ri-ia-at-ten
-
- 38 ki-e-ma nam-ma ŠA KUR URUHa-at-ti-pit KUR.KUR.ḪIA-
TIM³³ KUR URUGa-aš-ga³⁴
- 39 na-at LÚ.MEŠŠIPA.ŠAḪ³⁵ Ū LÚ.MEŠE-PIŠ KAT e-eš-šir^{36, 26}
- 40 Ū KUR URUA-ra-u-ya-an-na KUR URUKa-la-aš-ma³⁷ KUR
URULu-uk-ka³⁸

1. D I 13 URUDše-pl-ik-ku-uš-ta-aš.
3. D I 14 Ha-at-ti.
7. C has *ha*! In D the 'Winkelhaken' is apparently erased.
8. D I 17 Hur-la-aš KUR-e KUR URUKi-iz-zu-ya-at-ni.
9. D has 'the country of the Hurrians,' and adds 'Kizzuwatna.'
10. D I 18 nu-za-an.
11. D I 18 i-en-zi.
12. D I 18 NI-IŠ.
13. D I 18 šar-ra-an-ta-ti.
14. C omits this sentence.
15. Lit. 'for injury.'
16. D I 19 É DINGIR.MEŠ-ma.
17. D omits.
18. D I 20 DINGIR.MEŠ-aš.
19. D I 20 + i-.
20. D I 21 + u-.
21. D I 21 ka-a-aš-ta-an.
22. D omits these words.

- C II 23 Then we will
- 24 and, O Gods, take pity again upon the land of Hatti.⁴
- 25 On the one hand it is oppressed by the plague, [and] on
the other hand
- 26 it is oppressed by rebellion, and the independent countries
which
- 27 are round about,⁴ (namely) Mittanni⁹ and Arzawa,—
- 28 each one has reviled (?), and they do not
- 29 extol (?) the Gods, and they have broken the oath of the Gods,⁴
- D I 19 and they continually seek to injure¹⁵ the land of Hatti¹⁴
- C II 30 and the temples of the gods they seek to despoil.
- 31 Now unto the Gods let it become again (an occasion for)
vengeance,⁴
- 32 and the plague, rebellion, famine, (and) evil²² fever²²
- 33 send into the land of Mittanni²⁴ and the land of Arzawa.²⁶
- 34 Rested are the quarrelsome lands,
- 35 but the land of Hatti is a weary land ;
- 36 now loose the weary, but the rested
- 37 harness.
-
- 38 But these again (which are) actually Hatti-lands : Gasga—
- 39 they were swine-herds and weavers of linen²⁶—
- 40 and Arawanna, Kalasma,³⁹ Lukka,⁴⁰ (and)

23. So also D I 21. D I 22 adds [*A-NA*] KUR URUKi-iz-zu-ya-at-ni (erased ?).

24. So also D, which again adds 'the land of Kizzuwatna.'

25. D I 22 -te-en.

27. D I 23 [*ya-a*]r-ši-ja-an-da.

29. D *Ha-at*-. 30. D I 23 -e-.

33. D I 25 KUR.KUR.TIM.

35. D I 26 +e-še-ir.

37. D I 27 [KURUR]^UKa-la-a-aš-pa.

39. D has 'Kalaspa.'

26. Division line in D.

28. D I 23 KUR.KUR.TIM.

31. D I 24 -na.

34. D I 25 Ka-a-aš-ka.

36. D I 26 LÜ.MEŠE-PI-IŠ KAT.HI.A e-še-ir.

38. D I 27 KUR URULu-ug-ga-a.

40. D has 'Luggä.'

- C II 41 KUR [(URUP)]i-ta-aš-ša¹ na-aš-ta ki-e-ja KUR.KUR.Ī.A-TIM
 42 A-N[(A DUTU U)]RU A-ri-in-na a-ra-u-e-eš-ta^{3, 2} nu ar-ga-mu-uš
 43 ar-ḥa [(pi-e-eš)]-šir⁴ nu EGIR-pa⁵ KUR URUḤa-at-ti GUL-ḥa-an-ni-ja-u-ya-an da-[an-zi]⁶
 44 ka-ru-ú-[-i]a [(KUR U)]RUKUBABBAR-ti IŠ-TU DUTU URU A-ri-in-na⁷
 45 a-ra-aḥ-zé-na-aš A[-N]A KUR.KUR.Ī.A-TIM UR.MAḤ ma-a-an šar-ḥi-iš-ki-iš^{7, 2}
 46 nu pa-ra-a URUḤa-al-pa-an⁹ URUKÁ.DINGIR.RA-an¹⁰ ku-i-uš ḥar-ni-in-ki-iš-ki-iš
 47 nu KUR-e-aš ḥu-u-ma-an-da¹¹-aš [(a-aš-š)]u¹² KUBABBAR GUŠKIN DINGIR.MEŠ-ja¹³
 48 na-at PA-NI DUTU URU A-ri-in-na [(zi-ik-k)]i-ir¹⁶
-
- 49 ki-nu-na a-ra-aḥ-zé-na-an-te-eš¹⁷ [ud-ni?-an-t]e-eš¹⁸
 50 ḥu-u-ma-an-te-eš¹⁹ KUR URUKUBABBAR-ti [u(a-al-ḥ)]a-an-ni-eš-ki-u-ya-an²⁰ da-a-ir²¹
 51 na-at A-NA DUTU URU A-ri-in-na kat-ta-ya-a-tar
 52 nam-ma ki-ša-a-ru²² nu-za DINGIR-LUM²³ tu-el²⁴ ŠUM-KA
 53 li-e²³ te-ip-ša-nu-ši²⁵
-
- 54 nu A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ²⁷ ku-iš²³ kar-pi-iš²³ kar-tim-mi-ja-az²⁸
 55 ku-iš DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš³⁰ Ū-UL na-aḥ-ḥa-an-za na-aš-ta³¹ li[-(e)]
 56 a-aš-ša¹¹-u-e-eš i-da-a-la-u-ya-aš an-da ḥar-kán-zi
 57 na-aš ma-a-an I-EN URU.KI³² na-aš-ma[(-at I)-EN É-TUM]
 58 na-aš-ma I-EN LÚ! nu DINGIR.MEŠ a-pu-u-un[(-pit)]
 59 I-an³³ ḥar- .[.]³⁴

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. D KUR URUPi-i-[-(a-aš-ša)]. | 2. Division line in D. |
| 3. D I 28 a-ra-a-u-e-eš-še-ir. | 4. D II 1 pi-e-eš-še-i-e-ir. |
| 5. D II 1 a-ap-pa. | 6. D II 2 perhaps [GUL-ḥa-an-ni-ḥ]a-an-zi. |
| 7. For these two lines D has: (2) nu ka-ru-ú KUR URUḤa-at-ti URU A-ri-in-na-aš. | |
| (3) [IŠ-TU DUTU za-jaḥ-ḥa-it a-ra-aḥ-zé-na KUR-e UR.MAḤ ma-a-an a-ar[-aš-ki-iš]. | |
| 8. D has 'used to invade with battle.' | |
| 9. D II 4+ku-i-uš. | 10. D II 4 omits -an. |
| 11. D II 5, 11+ -a. | 12. D II 5+ <-tum> -mi-it. |
| 13. D II 5 DINGIR.MEŠ da-pi?-aš? | 14. D has 'all (?) the gods.' |
| 15. D has 'it.' | 16. D II 6 zi-ik-ki-i-ḥ. |
| 16. D II 7 ud-ne-e-an-te-eš ¹⁶ , for which the space on C is insufficient. | 17. D II 7 -]zé-ni-e-eš. |
| 19. D II 7+KUR.KUR.MEŠ. | |

C II 41 Pitassa ; now these lands also

42 have set themselves free from the Sun-goddess of Arinna ² and

43 have cast off (their) tribute (like a burden), and are beginning
in their turn to attack the land of Hatti.

44 For of old the land of Hatti with the help of the Sun-goddess
of Arinna

45 used to rage (?) against ⁸ the surrounding lands like a lion.²

46 And moreover whatever (cities such as) Halpa and Babylon
it used to destroy,

47 the possessions of every country, the silver, the gold, and the
gods ¹⁴—

48 they ¹⁵ used to place them before the Sun-goddess of Arinna.

49 But now all the surrounding countries

50 have begun to attack the land of Hatti.

51 And unto the Sun-goddess of Arinna let it become again

52 (an occasion for) vengeance ; and, O deity,²³

53 bring not thy name into contempt.²⁶

54 Now whosoever ²⁹ is (an object of) anger ²³ (or) wrath to the
Gods,

55 not having paid respect to the Gods, then let not

56 the good perish among the wicked ;

57 and whether it be a single city or a single [household]

58 or a single man, O Gods

59 s[pare(?)] that single one.³⁴

20. D II 8 *ya-al-h[a-a]n-mi-u-ya-an.*

21. D II 8 *da-a-i-ir.*

23. D omits this word.

25. D II 9 *te-ip-n[u]-uš-ki-ši.*

26. Lit. 'do not diminish.' D omits the negative ! See commentary.

27. D II 10 *nu ma-a-an DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš.*

28. D II 10 *kar-²⁷dim-mi-ja-az.*

29. D has 'if anyone.'

30. D II 10 *[A-N]A DINGIR.MEŠ.*

32. D II 12 *URU-LUM.*

33. D II 13 *I-EN.*

34. Division line in D, but apparently not in C.

22. D II 9 *ki-i-ša-ru.*

24. D II 9 *tu-ell-el.*

31. D II 11 *na-pa.*

- D II 14 KUR URU $\overline{H}$ a-at¹-ti-ma-aš-ta an[-da aš-ša-u-i]t IGI. $\overline{H}$ I.A-it
a-uš-te-en
15 i-da-a-lu-ma² $\overline{h}$ i-in-kán [a-pi-e-da-aš³ u]d-ne- $\overline{z}$ [a¹-aš¹ p]i¹-i-š-
<te->en

-
- 16 I-NA KUR URU $\overline{H}$ a-at-ti-ma [.] . [. . .
17 nu KUR URU $\overline{H}$ a-at-ti a[- . . .
-

(Here follows the colophon in D : see below.)

SECTION IV : CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS SECTION
AND PRAYER FOR BLESSING

(a) A and B to Telipinu

- B II 3 nu KUR.KUR. $\overline{H}$ I.A LÚKÚR ku-e šu-ul-l[(a-an-ta $\overline{h}$ ar-šal-la-
an-ta)]
4 ku-e-eš-kán tu-uk A-NA D[(Te-lí-pi-ni Û A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ
URU $\overline{H}$ a-at-ti UL)]
5 na-a $\overline{h}$ - $\overline{h}$ a-an-te-eš ku-i-e-eš-ma-az⁴ [(šú-me-en-za-an É. $\overline{H}$ I.A
DINGIR.MEŠ-KU-NU ar- $\overline{h}$ a $\overline{y}$ a-ar-nu-um-ma-an-zi)]
6 i-la-lí-iš⁵-kán-zi ku-e-eš-ma BI-IB-RI. $\overline{H}$ I.A GAL. $\overline{H}$ I.A [Û-
NU-UT]
7 KUBABBAR GUŠKIN da-an-na ša-an- $\overline{h}$ i-iš-kán-zi ku-e-eš[-
ma-za (A.ŠĀ A.QAR-KU-NU)]
8 GIŠSAR GEŠTIN GIŠSAR SAR GIŠTIR dan-na⁶-ta-a $\overline{h}$ - $\overline{h}$ u-u⁷-
 $\overline{y}$ a-an-zi [ša-an- $\overline{h}$ i-iš-ká]n-zi
9 ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za LÚ.MEŠAPIN.LAL LÚ.MEŠNU.GIŠ.SAR
GEŠTIN LÚ.MEŠNU.GIŠ.SAR [(SAR SAL.MEŠ)] NA₄ARĀ
10 da-an-na ša-an- $\overline{h}$ i-iš-kán-zi nu i-da-lu-un ta-pa-aš⁹-ša[-(an)
 $\overline{h}$ i-in-]kán
11 ka-a-aš-ta-an-na NAM. $\overline{H}$ I.A- $\overline{z}$ a a-pi-e-da-aš A-NA KUR
K[UR. $\overline{H}$ I.A L]ÚKÚR p[a-]a-i
-
- 12 A-NA LUGAL-ma SAL.LUGAL DUMU.MEŠ.LUGAL Û
A-NA KUR URU $\overline{H}$ a-at-ti TI-tar $\overline{h}$ a-at-tu¹⁰-la-tar
13 in-na-ra- $\overline{y}$ a-tar MU.KAM GID.DA EGIR UD-MI du-uš-ga-
ra-at-ta-an-na p[i-eš-k]i
-

1. C II 59 KUBABBAR.
3. Cf. C III 11.

2. Last sign in C. About 5 lines missing.
4. A III 21 ku-e-da-aš-ma-az !

- D II 14 Look upon the land of Ḫatti with [auspicious] glance ;
 15 but give (?) the evil pestilence [to those] countries (?).

-
- 16 But in(to ?) the land of Ḫatti [.]
 17 and the land of Ḫatti . [.]
-

(Here follows the colophon in D : see below.)

SECTION IV : CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS SECTION
 AND PRAYER FOR BLESSING

(a) A and B to Telipinu

- B II 3 And (as for) the enemy-countries which are quarrelling and
 raging,
 4 and who (!) pay no respect to thee, Telipinu, and to the Gods
 of Ḫatti,
 5 and who desire to burn up your temples,

 6 and who seek to take the rhyta, the bowls, [the utensils of]

 7 silver and gold, and who your fields

 8 vineyards, gardens (and) groves ^a [see]k to lay waste,

 9 and who seek to take your ploughmen, vine-dressers,
 gardeners, (and) women of the mill ;
 10 now the evil fever, the [pla]gue

 11 and the famine and the locusts give to these enemy-countries.

-
- 12 But to the king, the queen, the princes, and to the land of
 Ḫatti, grant life, health,
 13 manliness (?), long years and future joy.
-

5. A III 22 *ex*.

8. All these words lit. singular.

6. A IV 4+ *-at-*.

9. A omits.

7. A IV 4 omits.

10. A IV 10 *du*.

- B II 14 [... *ḥa*]l-ki-ia-aš GIŠGEŠTIN-aš GIŠše-e-ša¹-na-aš GUD.
 ḪIA-aš UDU.ḪIA-aš MĀŠ.ḪIA[-aš]
 15 [(ŠAḪ-aš ANŠU.GIR)]NUN.NA.ḪIA-aš ANŠU-aš² *gi-im-*
ra-aš ḥu-u-it-ni-it
 16 [(DUMU.LÚ.GÁL.LU-aš-ša Š)]A EGIR UD-MI *mi-ia-a-tar*
pi-iš-ki nu mi-e-eš-ša³-du
 17 [(ḥe-e⁴)-m(u⁵-u)š⁶-š(a⁷) (nu) š⁷-i-š-ša-ya-aš⁵ *ḥu-u-*
ya-du-uš⁶ i-ia-an-ta-ru
 18 [⁷(nu (I-NA) KUR UR)]UKUBABBAR⁸-ti ma-a-ú š⁷-i-š-du⁹
nu pa¹⁰-an-ku-[(uš a-pa-a-at)]
 19 e-eš-du ḥal-za-a-i.

(b) C to Sun-goddess of Arinna

C III About 5 lines missing.^{1a}

- 1 i¹-ḫ[a²-li²-i-š/eš³-ká]n¹-z[i¹ k]u¹-e¹-eš¹-ma[-aš¹-za¹]
 2 BI-IB-R[IḪI.]A² [GAL.ḪIA] Ū-NU-TEMEŠ ŠA [KUBAB-
 BAR GUŠKIN]
 3 da-an-na š[a-a]n-ḥi-iš-kán-zi
 4 ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za A-ŠĀ A.QAR.ḪIA-KU-NU GIŠSAR.MEŠ
 . . . [-K]U-NU
 5 GIŠTIR.MEŠ-KU-NU ta-an-na-at-ta-u-ya-an-zi
 6 ša-an-ḥi-iš-kán-zi ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za
 7 LÚ.MEŠAPIN.LAL LÚ.MEŠNU.GIŠ.SAR SAL.MEŠ NA₄ARĀ
 8 ta-an-na ša-an-ḥi-iš-kán-zi
 9 nu i-da-a-lu-un ta-pa-aš-ša-an ḥi-in-kán
 10 ga-aš-ta-an DUTU URU⁴A-ri-in-na GAŠAN-IA
 11 a-pi-e-da-aš A-NA KUR.KUR.ḪIA LÚKÚR pa-a-i
-
- 12 nu-za DUTU URU⁴A-ri-i[n-na-ḫi]a¹ zi-ki-la
 13 mu-ki-eš-ki-iḥ-ḥu-u[t] . . . [. . .] . [. . .
 14 ú-e-š-ri-ia-an-z[a-ma EGIR-pa¹³ ḥu-i-eš-du (?)]
 15 na-aš-ta A-NA I[Mur-ši-i-lí LUGAL-i Ū]¹⁴
 16 A-NA KUR URU⁴Ha-at-ti [an-da aš-šu-lí]
 17 ne-iš-ḥu-ut nu A-N[A LUGAL Ū A-NA KUR URU⁴Ha-at-ti]¹⁴
 18 TI-tar ḥa-at-tu-ḫa-tar in-na-ra-ya-tar]

1. A IV 12+-an-.

2. aš written over KUR¹. A IV 13 ANSU.KUR.RA-aš.

3. A omits.

4. A 'horses.'

5. A IV 16 še-e-eš-ša¹-u-ya-aš.

6. A JV 16 IM.ḪIA-uš.

7. To judge from A, nothing before nu, the line being inset.

- B II 14 [And ?] of the crops, of the vines, of the almond (??)-trees,
 of oxen, sheep, goats,
 15 pigs, mules, asses ⁴—together with the wild life of the
 country—
 16 and of mankind grant [them ?] future abundance ; and may
 there be abundant
 17 rain (?) also (?) [. . . .] ; and may the winds of prosperity
 pass over
 18 and may the land of Ḫatti thrive and prosper. And the
 congregation
 19 cries ' Let it be so ! ' ¹¹

(b) C to Sun-goddess of Arinna

- C III About 5 lines missing. [As for the enemy-countries who] ¹²

- 1 d[esire (?)] and who (?)
 2 the rhyta, [the vats], the utensils of [silver and gold]

 3 continually seek to take from you ;
 4 and who your fields, your gardens,

 5-6 (and) your groves seek to lay waste, and who

 7 the farmers, the gardeners, (and) the women of the mill
 8 seek to take from you ;
 9 now the evil fever, the plague,
 10 (and) the famine, O Sun-goddess of Arinna, my lady,
 11 give to those enemy-countries.

 12 And, Sun-goddess of Arinna, be thou also (?), even thou,
 13 entreated ; [but may the]
 14 oppressed [. live again (?)].
 15 And to M[ursili the king and] ¹⁴
 16 to the land of Ḫatti turn [for blessing].
 17 And t[o the king and to the land of Ḫatti] ¹⁴
 18 [grant] life, health, [manliness]

8. A IV 17 *Ḫat*.

10. A IV 18+*a*.

12. These lines may be supplied from A III 18 ff. (=B II 3 ff.).

13. Cf. XVII 10 II 8.

14. For restoration cf. commentary on B I 4.

9. A IV 17 *še-eš-du*.

11. Lit. ' Let that thing be.'

- C III 19 ŠA EGIR UD-MI [du-uš-ga-ra-at-ta-an]
 20 [MU.KAM G]ID.DA-ia [pi-eš-ki
 21 [.] . . [.
 22-23 [.
 24 [.] . -uš? [. . .
-
- 25 [.] u-u-ma-an- . [.
 26 [.] hal-ki-ia-aš GİŠ[GEŠTIN-aš
 27 [GUD-aš MÁŠ-aš U]DU-aš ANŠU.KUR.R[A-aš
 28 [ŠA EGIR UD-MI m]i-ia-tar pi-eš-[ki nu-uš-ši]¹
 29 [.] . -tar tar-ḫu-u-i[-la-tar-ra pi-eš-ki]¹
 30 [nu-uš-ši LÚ-a]š pa-ra-a n[eⁱ-ia-an-ta-an]²
 31 [GİŠTUKUL-in pi-eš-ki nu-u]š-ši šeⁱ[-
 32 [.] . . [.
 33 [.] . . [.
 34 [.] . -ši? [.
 35 [.] -r]u nu DⁱU[TUⁱ URU A-ri-in-na]
 36 [A-NA KUR URU H-a-a]t-ti gi[-in-zu]¹
 37 [nam-ma da-a¹] na-at-za EGIR[.
 38 [.] ḫuⁱ-ya-an-du-uš a[pⁱ-
 39 eⁱ[-] . nu še-iš-du-ya-a[šⁱ?]³
 40 IM-an-te-eš i-ia-an-da-ru . [. ma-a-ú]
 41 še-iš-du nu šu-ma-a-aš A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ[><]
 42 NINDA.KUR₄.RA.ḪIA[-K]U-NU DUGiš-pa-an-tu-zi[-iš-me-
 it]¹
 43 ša-r[a-a ki-i]t-ta-ri¹ nu pa-an-ku-ú[š]
 44 [a-pa-a-at e-eš-d]u ḫal-za-i [><]
-

Remainder of column III lost, but probably uninscribed.

COLOPHONS

A

- IV 19 DUP-I-PU QA-TI LÚDUP.SAR-za GIM-an
 20 A-NA LUGAL še-ir PA-NI DⁱTe-ḫi-pi-nu
 21 UD.KAM-ti-ḫi ar-ku-ya-ar e-eš-ša-i
-

1. Restoration conjectural.^Δ

2. Restored from A III 13-14.

- C III 19 future [joy],
 20 and long [years.]

21-24 [.]

-
- 25 [. a]ll . [.
 26 [. of the cr]ops, of the v[ines, . . .
 27 [of oxen, goats, sh]eep, hors[es, . . .
 28 grant [future a]bundance. [And grant him] ¹
 29 [.]-ness [and] valou[r]
 30 [and grant him a man']s un-[sheathed (?)] ²
 31 [weapon ²; and grant] him . [. . .
 32 [.
 33 [.
 34 [.
 35 May [.]; and O S[un-goddess of Arinna']
 36 [take] pi[ty on the land of H]a[tti] ¹
 37 [again ¹], and [.] it back.
 38 [. w]inds (?) . [. .
 39 . . [.] And may the winds of prosperity
 40 pass over; . [. . . may thrive]
 41 (and) prosper. And to you, O gods,
 42 your food and drink offerings

 43 will be [presen]ted. And the congregation
 44 cries ' Le[t it be so !]' ⁴
-

Remainder of column III lost, but probably uninscribed.

COLOPHONS

A

- IV 19 One tablet, finished : when the scribe
 20 on behalf of the king before Telipinu
 21 daily makes a prayer.
-

3. Probably nothing more here, cf. A IV 16, B II 17.

4. Lit. ' Let that thing be ! '

C

IV Perhaps a few lines missing.

- 1 a[-] . -na mu-ga-u¹-ua¹-an-zi
 2 . [.] . dup-pi-ia-aš A-UA-TEMEŠ
 3 a-pi-ia a-ni-ia-nu-un nu DUTU URUA-ri-in-na
 4 URUKUBABBAR-ši I-NA UD VII.KAM mu-ki-eš-ki-nu-un
 5 I-NA URUA-ri-in-na-ia I-NA UD VII.KAM
 6 mu-ki-eš-ki-nu-un na-aš-ta ki-i A-UA-TEMEŠ
 7 an-da me-mi-iš-ki-nu-un mu-u-ga-u-ya-aš-ma
 8 ar-ha-ia-an ha-an-ti DUP-PI

D

- II 18 ma-a-an KUR-e an[-da ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri]¹
 19 nu-mu DUTU-ŠI [
 20 nu pa-a-un DINGIR.MEŠ m[u-ki-eš-ki-nu-un URUKUBAB-
 BAR-ši]²
 21 [URU]A-ri-in-ni URUZi[-ip-pa-la-an-ti URUNe-ri-ik-ki]³
 22 [nu] ki-i ud-da-a-a[r an-da me-mi-iš-ki-nu-un]²

23 [ŠU¹]zu-u-u[a

24 [.] . [

Remainder lost.

1. Restored from HT. 1 II 14-15.

2. Restored from C IV.

C

IV Perhaps a few lines missing.

- 1 . [.] . . to entreat,
- 2 the words of [.] tablet
- 3 there(on ?) I inscribed. And the Sun-goddess of Arinna
- 4 in Hattusa for 7 days I entreated,
- 5 and in Arinna for 7 days
- 6 I entreated ; and these words
- 7 I addressed (to her). But of the supplication
- 8 there is a special tablet separately (?).

D

- II 18 If [people are continually dying in] the land ¹
- 19 His Majesty . . . [.] me,
- 20 and I went, (and) [I entreated] the Gods [in Hattusa] ²
- 21 in Arinna, in Zi[ppalanta and in Nerik] ³
- 22 [and] these words [I addressed (to them)] ²

23 [By the hand of (?) -]zuwa[-

Remainder lost.

COMMENTARY

[For all lexicographical literature not expressly cited in these notes see Sturtevant, *HGL*.]

B I 1. *anda* with *mem(i̇)a-* functions sometimes as a postposition (as here) with a preceding dative, sometimes as a preverb with or without a preceding case-form. The compound verb *anda mem(i̇)a-* is very commonly used to introduce the incantation that follows some magical preparation,¹ and in all such cases it is clear that the preverb refers to the latter and does not modify the meaning of the verb. There is therefore no reason to suppose that *mem(i̇)a-* has any meaning other than its normal one of 'say, speak'; what is the force of *anda*? The peculiarity to be noted here is its use with a person (in this case the god). This usage also is not uncommon, both adnominally and with various verbs, and the following passages, though far from exhaustive, may suffice to give some idea of it:—

(a) With verbs of motion it is often possible to understand *anda* as 'in(to) (the country of),' thus preserving its literal meaning (cf. Sommer, *AU* 230); but see below, p. 42:

na-aš-kán tu-ruk an-da ú-iz-zi (*Targ.* I 7, *Al.* A III 41, *Kup.* § 15 C 19).

ka-a-aš-ma šu-ma-a-aš an-da ú-ù (*Kup.* § 6 C 6).

nu-kán I-aš I-e-da-ni pit-ti-ia-an-ti-li an-da li-e pa-iz-zi (*Kup.* § 27 A 29).

nam-ma-ták-kán ŠA KUR URUHa-at-ti ku-i-e-eš LÚ.MEŠpit-te-ia-an-te-eš an-da i-ia-an-ta-at (*Madd.* rev. 34).

na-aš-kán a-pi-e-da-ni an-da pa-ù (*Taw.* III 49 f.).

IR.MEŠ-I-A-ya-at-ták-kán ku-i-e-eš an-da ú-i-e-ir (*KBo.* III 4 II 10).

1. Dr. Leonie Zuntz has kindly supplied me with the following references from her exhaustive index of compound verbs: *KBo.* II 9 IV 9 (?), IV 1 I 7, 27, II 1 18, V 2 II 21; *KUB* VII 5 II 23 (21 I 6); IX 1 III 26, 27 I 25, 31 II 29, 50, 63, III 26, 36, 48 (=32 I 12, 19, 28); XII 26 III 8, 58 III 1; XV 34 III 22, IV 48, 42 II 7, 19, 28; XVII 12 II 5, 11, 25, 14 IV 15, 18 I 22, II 9, 14, 15, 35 IV 6; XX 66 III 11, 92 VI 6, 96 IV 8; XXIV 5 I 32, 12 III 18; XXV 23 IV 57; *VBoT* 24 III 35 f.

nu-ya-an-na-aš-kán NAM.RA.MEŠ URU[*Ha-at-ti-ia(?)*] *ku-iš an-da*
ú-ya-an-za (XIX 30 IV 8 f.).

zi-ik-ya-kán IPÍŠ.TUR-aš PA-NI A-BI-IA *pit-ti-ia-an-ti-li an-da*
ú-it (XIV 15 IV 39).

zi-ik I Ma-ad-du-ya-at-ta-aš *an-da A-NA A-BI DUTU-ŠI pid-da-iš*
(Madd. obv. 3). Similar *Kup.* § 2 D 5.

(b) In the following passages *anda* appears to mean 'in the house of':

nu-un-na-aš É-ir ku-it e-eš-šu-e-en nu-un-na-aš-kán DINGIR-LUM
an-da ar-ta-at (Hatt. III 6 f.). But see below under (c).

ma-a-an-ya-kán . . . KAB-tar *ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki an-da iš-dam-ma-aš*
te-ni (XXVI 1 III 49+8 III 11; cf. 1 III 55 f.).

ma-a-an DUTU-ŠI *ku-e-da-ni an-da i-da-a-lu iš-ta-ma-aš-ti* (Hukk.
I 27). The previous example shows that Friedrich was right
in his translation of this line (*Vert.* II 109) against Sommer's
alternative suggestion (*ibid.* 140).

(c) Perhaps developed from the last meaning *anda* sometimes has the
sense 'intimately with, in collusion with'; this is found with the
following verbs:

anda kiš- (see 1st plague-prayer, obv. 17 f. 35 [*Klf.* I 166-8], and
Friedrich, *Vert.* index): 'conspire with.'

anda ʔeriya- (see Friedrich, *Vert.* index): 'have intimate con-
versations with.'

anda handa- (see Sommer, *AU* 348 f.) 'make common cause with.'

anda ti-ia- in *Klf.* I 244 36 f.: *ma-aḫ-ḫa[-an-ma A-BU]-IA LUGAL-*
u-iz-ni e-ša-[at] (37) *nu-uš-ši [šu-me-e-eš]* DINGIR.MEŠ EN-
MEŠ-IA *an-da ti-i-ia[-at-ten]*

anda ar- in *Hatt.* III 6 f. (see above under (b)) may, in view of the
foregoing example, also belong here. Cf. *IŠ-TU ŠA DUTU-ŠI*
ma-aḫ-ḫa-an ar-ta-ti, *Kup.* § 13 C 7 f.

(d) Passages resembling the present text, where *anda* is used simply
for 'to' (cf. Gk. εἰς):

(*aššuli*) *anda nai-* (passim).

nu-ya-ták-kán A-NA LÚ.MEŠ URUKar-ki-ša an-da ya-a-tar-na-aḫ-
ḫu-un (XIV 15 IV 24).

ku-it a-aš-šu na-at-kán A-NA DINGIR-LIM an-da me-m[a-a-i]
(XXVII 1 III 18).

nu DINGIR.MEŠ . [.] tal-li-ia-zi na-aš-ta an-da ki-iš-ša-an
me-mi-iš-ki-iz-zi (VII 60 II 19 f.).

na-aš-kán A-NA DINGIR-LIM IGI-an-da ti-ia-zi nu-kán ŠA LUGAL
SILIM-ul-an KUR-e-aš-ša hu-u-ma-an-da-aš SILIM-ul an-da
me-ma-a-i (X 91 III 10).

It is clear that in the last three examples and in the present line *anda mem(i)a-* means 'to address' words (acc.) to someone (dat.), though the dative may be omitted where the person in question has been mentioned in a previous sentence. The same sense may therefore also be assumed for all the instances cited on p. 40 n. 1, and for C IV 7 (p. 38). It is also possible that the whole of group (a) should be included under (d) (cf. Sommer, *AU* 154).

The translation 'reads' for *memiškizzi* here is necessitated by the object *tuppi* 'tablet,' and has nothing to do with *anda*. The usage is similar to that of *halzai-* (Sommer, *HAB* 178).

This line explains the form of introduction to the 2nd plague-prayer (*KIF*. I 206): it is the scribe that speaks, not, as Götze supposed (*ibid.* 220), the tablet itself.¹ So also letters were intended to be read by the messenger: see Schachermeyr, *Hethiter und Achäer* 138; Schroeder, *Real. Ass.* II 62.

B I 2. *yalliškizzi*. This verb has two distinct uses:—

- (a) Without *-za* and with acc. of a god, *KBo.* IV 6 I 19, II 25; *KUB* XXIV 7 I 22, 24 (on which see Götze, *AM* 262). The meaning 'praise' is assured by *KBo.* IV 6, where it follows recovery of health; cf. Accad. *dalilika ludlul*.
- (b) With *-za* 'praise oneself, boast.' IV 1 I 17 f.: *nu-za a-pi-en-za-an ŠU.DIM₄ ha-aš-ta-i ya-al-li-iš-kán-zi šu-ma-ša-za DINGIR.-MEŠ te-ip-nu-ir* 'The Kaska-men) boast of their own fist and bone (=offensive and defensive strength),² and have treated you, O Gods, with contempt.' Similarly *KBo.* V 6 I 4 (Sommer, *BoSt.* 7 59).³

The simple verb occurs in the forms *yalla-* (pres. 1 sing. *ya-al-la-aḥ-ḥi*, XXIV 7 I 12, 22, 24), *yalliia-* (verbal noun *ya-al-li-ia-tar*, VI 45 III 48,³

1. So also Ehelolf, *Berl. Mus. Ber.* 1928, p. 33a fn. 2.

2. See Sommer, *AU* 180 ff.

3. *Ibid.* 95.

XXI 38 I 48, 51) and *yalija-* (pres. 3 pl. *ya-li-ia-an-zi*, VI 46 IV 28; pret. 3 sing. *ya-li-at*, *Mil.* lower edge 3).

Is this verb in any way connected with the noun (UZU)*yalla-*? This is a part of the body mentioned often as a sacrificial offering with *haštai* 'bone'; it occurs also once with a single *l*, UZU*ya-al-la-an* (XXVII I III 20).¹ It is noteworthy that these two passages and HT. 38 obv. 3 (*ya-al-la-an* without *haštai*) are the only ones where the word stands in the acc.; elsewhere the phrase is (UZU)*ya-al-la-aš ha-aš-ta-i*, even where it forms the object of the verb, as in *KBo.* II 14 IV 2; *KUB* VII 13 rev. 16, XII 11 III 22, XX 13 IV 7, XXVII 1 III 18. In these texts *ya-al-la-aš* can hardly be anything but gen. sing., and the bone must then be part of it: where both words stand in the acc. the construction must be the *σχημα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος* so familiar in Hittite texts.² In XXVII 1 III 18 ff. the UZU*ya-al-la-aš ha-aš-ta-i* of a sheep is cooked and carved with a bronze knife. Further, in XVII 10 IV 34 we have *ku-un-na-aš ya-al-la-aš* 'the right *yalla-*,' and in *Bo.* 2274 (*ap.* Ehelolf, *KUB* XXVII, p. v) *ZAG-aš ú-ya-al-la-aš*; also in XX 1 III 7 *ya-al-la-aš ha-aš-ta-i* *KAB-la-aš* ['bone of the left *yalla-* (?)'. Hence there is ample support for the suggestion made by Sayce in 1927 (*RA* 24 125) that *yalla-* means 'leg,' or perhaps rather 'thigh'; in fact the ideogram for the latter (UZUZAG.DIB) inflects as an *a-* stem (UZUZAG.DIB-*an*, *VBoT* 24 IV 25), though there is no direct evidence that it is equivalent to *yalla-*.

From this the transition to 'strength' is natural, and in XIX 13 I 48 (annals of Suppiluliuma) the city of Timmuḫala is described as [ŠA'KUR UR]UG*a-aš-ga ya-al-li-ia-aš pi-e-da-an*, apparently 'stronghold of the Kaska-land.'³ However, the *yallēš* of *KBo.* IV 1 I 47 ff. and II 20 ff. remains mysterious: these are apparently charms, of gold, silver, iron, and bronze, each weighing 1 half-shekel, and are deposited in different parts of the house, 4 under each *halḫaltumari*, 4 under each *kurakki*, 4 under the ZAG.GAR.RA and 4 under the KI.IZI, in each case together with 8 or 9 miniature models of the thing in question; thus they cannot be accounted for as 'legs or supports (of the *ištanan-*)' (so Sturtevant in *HGL*).

1. UZU*li-la-an* VII 1 III 25 is probably the same word, and this is part of the rump (Sommer, *HAB* 81).

2. Friedrich, *Vert.* I 43 ff.; Götze, *AM* 214; Sommer, *AU* 29 f.

3. Otherwise Cavaignac, *REAn.* 32 241. In the description of Timmuḫala in XIX 37 II 1 ff. (Götze, *AM* 166) it is tempting to restore *A-NA KUR URUGa-[aš-ga ya-al-li-ia-aš pi-e-da-an]*, but the space appears to be insufficient.

The verbs *yalluš*k- in XIX 20 rev. 12, for which Forrer's translation 'be strong' is only approximately right,¹ and *yallanu*- 'treat violently' (?) in the phrase ŠUM-an *ya-al-la-nu-u*[z-zi] (XXVI 43 II 37),² evidently belong with *yalla*- 'thigh (?)'; but whether this group of words is connected with *yalla*- (etc.) 'praise, boast' seems very doubtful in view of the difference in meaning.

B I 3. *šarku*š=Sum. GÚ.TUG, Accad. *ašaridu* 'first in rank, pre-eminent, KBo. I 42 II 20. But Güterbock in ZA. NF. X 60 points out that in Bo. 2865 *šar-ga-u-e-eš* (II 14) varies with LÚKAL (II 23). It is a common epitheton ornans: see Sommer, AU 91, who himself compares]*šar-ku-uš* LUGAL-uš[XXI 24 9 with LUGAL KALA(G).GA XXI 38 obv. 55. Yet elsewhere (LÚ)KALA(G.GA) is an -a- stem: acc. LÚKALA-an, XXIV 7 II 4; nom. KALAG.GA-aš, V 4 I 20, XXIV 7 II 22, XXII 70 obv. 69, 81 (but cf. Sommer, AU 182 on this text); nom. (?) pl. LÚMEŠKALA-aš, XXIV 7 II 23. LÚKALA-an-za, KBo. III 4 I 12, KUB XXIV 8 I 42, can hardly be=*šarku*anza, since this is the participle of *šarku*ya/e- 'put on shoes, boots, etc.',³ and the equation with in(n)*ar*anza (Götze, Madd. 82 and AM 290) remains possible. Hence, if the Hittites ever read (LÚ)KALA(G.GA) as *šarku*-, this was evidently not the only possibility.

nakkış=Accad. *kabtu*, in good and bad sense: see Götze, Hatt. 93 f.

On DINGIR-uš=*šiu*š, a bye-form of *šiumi*š 'god,' see Ehelolf in ZA. NF. IX 180.

B I 4=A I 5. SAL.LUGAL-aš-ša. The queen and (except in this line) the princes are regularly associated with the king in the prayer to Telipinu (A+B); viz. A II 11, A III 4, B II 12. C, however, in the only line where this can be checked, namely C I 22 (=A II 11), and therefore probably in other passages where the text is broken, omits both the queen and the princes, and they are omitted in the parallel introduction to the 2nd plague-prayer (KIF. I 206). For a possible historical explanation of these facts see introduction, pp. 13-14.

1. Forrer, Forsch. II 30. But in XXIII 77 79 it takes an object -an, and is certainly a hostile act, since the paragraph concerns LÚKÜR 'enemy' (XIII 27 obv. 6-8, see Götze in KUB XXVI foreword on no. 40).

2. A kind of 'internal hiph'il.' Cf. *nunlarnu*- 'exert oneself.'

3. Bo. 2721 II 10 f. KUŠE.SIR.ĪLA TUGKAT.DAM *šar-ku-ya-an šar-zi* 'she has put on shoes (and) gaiters (?)' (Götze, NBr. 77²); XX 4 I 8 [KUŠE.SI]R-uš *šar-ku-e-iz-zi* 'he puts on shoes'; XXIV 8 I 26 [GIŠ]NAD-aš *šar-ku-ya[a-a]n-za še-eš-ki-i* 'he went to bed in his boots' (Sommer, HAB 86).

SAL.LUGAL inflects as an *a*-stem, both in its ordinary use and as the title of the goddess of Katapa: nom. SAL.LUGAL-*aš*, e.g. Friedrich, *Vert.* II 204, *HT* 38 obv. 10, *KUB* VIII 41 II 3, 9, X 49 4, XXI 38 I 47, ^DSAL.LUGAL-*aš*, Friedrich, *Vert.* II 220, *KUB* XXIII 75 4; acc. SAL.LUGAL-*an*, XXVI 11 I 13 (exceptions: nom. SAL.LUGAL-*iš*, *KBo.* IV 10 rev. 2; acc. SAL.LUGAL-*un*, 1780/c IV 24, *ap.* Ehelolf, *ZA* NF. IX 186²). The preceding consonant is shown to be *r* by the dat. SAL.LUGAL-*ri*,¹ and Ehelolf in *ZA* NF. IX 186 well suggests that the word may therefore have ended with the suffix *-šara-*, which is used to form feminines in Hittite. The beginning of the word is perhaps provided by *KBo.* I 3 rev. 20, where the goddess of Katapa appears as ^D*H*a[. . .]: see Weidner, *BoSt.* 8 50 with fn. 2. From this evidence one cannot but construct **haššuššaraš*, on the analogy of *ešhaššaraš*; but this is no more than a hypothesis.

B I 6. DINGIR-LAM ŠA SAG.DU-NI. Telipinu is thus the patron deity of Mursili, as the Weather-god *pihaššaššiš* and 'Ištar' of Samuḫa were of Muwatalli and Ḫattusili respectively; cf. Friedrich, *Vert.* II 84¹, Sommer, *AU* 284, Götze, *Kultur.* 125.

B I 6. *mugāi*. The infinitive of this verb is equated with the Accadian *tazimtu* in *KUB* III 103 5:

[x=] *ta-zi-im-du=mu-ga-u[-ya-ar]*.

There is a well-known Accadian word *tazzimtu* 'complaint' from *nažāmu* 'complain of.'² For this reason it has always been accepted that *mugā* means 'complain'³; though, as this was found to be not entirely in accordance with the actual usage, most commentators have added 'anflehen, implore.'⁴ *mugayar* has regularly been translated 'Klagegebet, lamentation.'

It can be shown conclusively that the verb has nothing whatever to do with lamentation. For we have a number of texts in which the

1. Not SAL.LUGAL-*RI* (considered as a possibility by Sturtevant, *HGL* 131), since SAL.LUGAL-*TUM*, *Bo.* 3518 5 (ref. supplied by Ehelolf), and SAL.LUGAL-*TI*, VI 45 III 5 XII 28 9, prove that the Accadian equivalent was *ŠARRATU*. Hence the acc. (!) SAL.LUGAL-*ri* in *KBo.* IV 13 VI 10 must be a scribal error; in fact 'ya' is written for SAL in the previous line, and *-nu* is omitted in line 17. It is nevertheless remarkable that the *r* is known only from this dative form.

2. Landsberger, *ZDMG* LXIX 514-5.

3. Friedrich, *ZA* NF I 12 with fn. 3; Götze, *Hatt.* 100, *Madd.* 63¹.

4. Friedrich, *Vert.* II 24; Sturtevant, *HGL* 104.

procedure termed *mugā-* (or its derivatives) is described in detail; and they are remarkably consistent.

The present text itself provides the clearest evidence. The only section which could possibly be described as a lamentation, namely the 'plague-prayer,' section III, is found only on tablets C and D. A+B contain, as we have seen, only an invocation, a hymn of praise, and a prayer that fever, plague, famine and locusts should be driven forth into the lands of enemies, and that happiness and prosperity should be granted to Hatti and its royal family. Yet the term *mugā-* is practically confined to B and the corresponding part of C.

The terms used in the four texts are as follows:

B I 5-6: *i-it-ya* ^D*Te-li-pi-nu-un* . . . *mu-ga-a-i*.

I 12: *nu-ut-ta ka-a-ša mu-ki-iš-ki-mi* NINDA^A*har-ši-it* DUG^{iš}*pa-an-du-uz-zi-it*

A IV 21: *ar-ku-ya-ar e-eš-ša-i*.¹

C I 3=B I 12.

III 12-13: *zi-ki-la mu-ki-eš-ki-iḫ-ḫu-u[t]*

IV 3-4: DUTU URU^A*ri-in-na* . . . *mu-ki-eš-ki-nu-un*

(IV 7-8: *mu-u-ga-u-ya-aš-ma ar-ḫa-ia-an ḫa-an-ti* DUP-*Pf*.)²

D II 20 (??): DINGIR.MEŠ *m[u-ki-eš-ki-nu-un]*

In the four following texts a prayer closely resembling A+B is accompanied by various ritual actions, and correspondingly the whole procedure is described by *mugā-* in conjunction with several other terms:

(i) XV 35+KBo. II 9 // KBo. II 36. After preliminary sacrifices and singing (XV 35 I 1-20) the goddess Ishtar of Nineveh is besought to come from wherever she may be, whether in foreign lands, in rivers or springs, among the ox-herds or shepherds, or among the gods of the Underworld (the so-called 'evocatio'),³ to bring blessings on the land of Hatti, which is afflicted, and to transfer the affliction to her enemies. The end of the prayer falls in the lacuna caused by the loss of columns II and III. In col. IV the same purpose is being attempted by means of sacrifices and sympathetic magic. In lines 1-8 offerings are made to the goddess on a table and others are at the same time thrown into a spring; in the following lines she is apparently pulled physically (SUD,

1. This shows that the terms *mugā-* and *arkuya-* are not mutually exclusive. On *arkuya-* see below, p. 49 fn. 3.

2. The meaning of this is obscure. See *ad. loc.*

3. Sommer, *ZA* XXXIII 101; cf. Götze, *Kulturg.* 127 fn. 14.

huittiia-) from 'GAR' *ha-az-zi-zi-ta* (12) and from the fire (21). Finally there is mention of the Underworld Gods (XV 35 IV 39) and a prayer for the might of the royal family.

Terms used, introducing the prayer :

XV 35 I 22 : [*ka-a-ša-at-ta* ? *hu-it-ti-ia-an-ni-iš-ki-mi nu-ut-du-za*
tal-li[-eš-ki-mi]

23 [*mu-ki-iš-ki-mi-ia* ?]

KBo. II 36 2 : *ka-a-ša-at-ta*[
3 *mu-ki-eš-ki-mi-ia*] } Restore as above.

(ii) XV 32 (=31). A very similar text to the foregoing. Preliminary sacrifices (I 1-33) ; the ritual of pulling the deities (I 35-6)¹ ; a prayer, consisting of 'evocatio' and prayer for blessing (I 39-59) ; further extensive sacrifices (II and III) ; further sacrifices and 'pulling' (IV).²

Terms used :

I 49 ff. : *ki-nu-na-ya-aš-ma-aš* *hu-u-it-ti-ia-an-ni-eš-ki-u-ya-ni tal-li-eš-ki-u-ya-ni mu-ki-iš-ga-u-e-ni* SISKUR.
SISKUR-*ia-ya-aš-ma-aš* *pi-eš-ga-u-e-ni*

31 IV 36 ff. : *ma-a-an* ^{DMAH}.MEŠ, etc. KAS.MEŠ-*az hu-it-ti-ia-an-zi*. This is the title of the ritual : 'When they draw the MAH deities etc. from a journey.'

(iii) XV 34 (=33a, 33b and 38), translated by L. Zuntz, *TIS* : a more elaborate version of the two preceding texts. The 'Cedar-gods' are here attracted by means of 'paths' (KAS) consisting of a strip of cloth (^{TUG}*kureššar*) and various kinds of food. The ritual is repeated eight times to attract the gods from different localities or elements. The kernel of the ritual is again a prayer of exactly the same type as in nos. i and ii, i.e. 'evocatio,' specifying in each case the locality from which the gods are to be attracted, and prayer for blessing on Hatti and the royal family.

Terms used :

huittiia- and its derivatives are frequent throughout.

ki-nu-na-aš-ma-aš *hu-it-ti-ia-an-ni-iš-ki-u-ya-ni tal-li-iš-ki-u-e-ni mu-ki-iš-ga-u-e-ni*, IV 31, (9).

1. *IŠ-TU* ^{SfG} *SIA i-ja-an-da-aš* [^{SfG}*hu-ut-tu-u*].*li-it TUGku-ri-eš-ni-it-ta hu-it-ti-ia-an-zi*.

2. This part is better preserved in no. 31 III 39 ff.

ú-i-ja-iz-z[?], IV 19; *ú-i-e-iš-ki-iz-zi*, I 34; and *ú-i-iš-ki-*, I 73. This verb appears to mean 'entice,' see Zuntz, *ad. loc.*

The prayers are introduced merely by the words *mema-* or *te-*.¹

(iv) IX 27+VII 8+VII 5.² A ritual for restoring a man's sexual powers. This begins with sympathetic magic (IX 27 I 19 ff.), but the kernel of the ritual is a prayer of a similar kind to those already cited. The god is entreated to come from wherever he is (VII 5 I 13 ff.), to visit the man, and grant him children, who shall serve the god thereafter (VII 8 II). Then the sacrifices and food are set out on a table and the man sleeps by them. This is done three times (VII 5 II 21 ff.), and the whole is repeated the following day. On the third morning the man tells whether the god has visited him in his dreams; if so, the ritual is finished, but if not, it is repeated (VII 5 IV).

Terms used :

*D*U-li-li-ja-aš-ši-in ši-ip-pa-an-da[h-hi] na-an I-NA UD III.KAM
mu-u-ga-a-mi IX 27 I 4-5.

I-NA UD I.KAM-ma III-ŠU mu-u-ga-mi VII 5 II 21 (cf. IV 5).

nu-ut-ta ki-i še-ir ku-e-da-ni ud-da-a-ni mu-ki-eš-ki-u-a-ni VII 8
II 20.

nu-ud-du-za ka-a-ša mu-u-ki-iš-ki-<mi> tal-li-eš-ki-mi (VII 5 I 23).

Such are the associations of the verb *mugā-* in religion.³ It is obvious that it became attached to a well-defined type of prayer, which in the texts here edited is represented, not by the 'plague-prayer,' in which, as we have seen, the word does not occur at all (with the doubtful exception of D II 20), but by A+B.

The verb is also used, however, in a more mundane context :

KBo. III 7 I 12. The Weather-god enlists the support of the other gods against the serpent Illuyankas, who has inflicted some injury on him : DIM-aš-ta-aš-ša DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš hu-u-ma-a[n-du]-uš mu-u-ga-it 'And thereupon (?) the Weather-god . . . -ed all the gods.' There

1. In I 34 Zuntz would read : LÚAZU a[r-ku-a]r(?) ki-[iš-ša-an] me-ma-i; but the word is more probably *uddar*, for *arkuvar* is construed either with *ija-*, *ešša-*, or *da-*, but never with *mema-*. Similarly in II 32 the text seems to read LÚAZU-aš me-mi-ja-aš (see below, p. 53).

2. VII 8 joins IX 27; VII 5 is the lower part of the tablet. IX 27 has been translated by Friedrich in *AO XXV* 2, p. 16.

3. The similarity of all these texts has been pointed out by Zuntz, *TIS* 7.

follows a single imperative clause, which Götze translates 'Punish them' ¹; but the words are unintelligible.

XXIII 77 65 ff.: [ma-a-an] DUTU-ŠI-ma LÚKAS₄.E I-NA KUR URUKa-aš-ga pi-i-ja-mi nu-uš-ši. [.]-iš-ši na-an-za LÚtak-šu-la-aš (66) [li-]e mu-ga-a-ši nu-uš-ši ki-iš-ša-an li-e te-ši ma-a-aḥ-ḥa-an-ū[a]ša-ra-a a-ar-ti (67) [. . .]-ya-kán ḥu-ya-a-i nu-ya EGIR-pa am-mu-uk kat-ta-an [not more than 6 signs].

'But if I, the solar Majesty, send a runner into the land of Kasga, you [shall not ?] to him, and as a man of loyalty (?) you shall not mugā- him, and you shall not say to him (i.e. you shall not mugā- him, saying) "When you come up [to Ḥatti?], [then] hurry (?), and [. . . .] back with me".'

The exact meaning of the words here spoken—and therefore of the whole paragraph—is not clear to me; but at least these words are evidently a request for some personal favour.

The last two passages clearly show that the essence of a *mugayar* is an imperative clause, i.e. a demand or request of some kind. It should also be noted that not only in the passages here quoted, but also in every text where the sentence in question is completely preserved,² the person addressed is the direct object of the verb; the only exceptions are VII 5 II 21 and XVII 23 I 1, where, though the person addressed is not mentioned and the verb is used intransitively, the context shows that the meaning is the same. Since the verb is always used of an inferior addressing a superior, the meaning can only be 'pray, entreat, beseech.'³

1. *Kultur*. 131.

2. *KBo.* III 16 rev. 10, 13 (incubation, with purpose of attracting the gods and conversing with them in dreams, as in no. iv; *muga-* // *tarijanu-*). *KUB* IX 12 I 2; XV 32 I 47, 49; XIV 4 III 29; XX 1 II 33; XXVII 16 III 15; *VBoT* 58 IV 10. In 2 *BoTU* 14 9; XXIII 77 74; and VII 13 rev. 20, 21 the sentence is mutilated.

3. The verb *talliḫa-* seems to be practically synonymous with *muga-*. The two verbs are used together for the 'evocatio' type of prayer in nos. i-iv above; and *talliḫa-* alone is used for the same type of prayer in VII 60 II 20 and III 6 (prayer II 22-32). It also occurs in a non-religious context in *Man.* A I 12 (Friedrich's restoration of DINGIR.MEŠ in 11 is questionable; the context suggests the men of Karkisa as the object). It is difficult to see how *talliḫa-* can be connected with the de-adjectival *tal-li-i-e-eš* in *VBoT* 24 III 39 (// *mi-i-e-eš*, on which see below, p. 114).

darijanu-, which is also associated with *muga-* (see previous note), and which was supposed by Götze (*Hatt.* 100) to mean 'invoke' solely on the basis of *KBo.* III 16 rev. 10 ff., is shown by *Taw.* II 57 to imply a request. If it is the causative of *tariḫa-* 'grow weary' (on which see below, p. 99 ff.) perhaps the literal meaning is 'importune.'

The relation of *arkuḫar* to *mugayar* is that of the general to the special. We have seen that our text A is entitled *arkuḫar* in the colophon. It is the only term used for the plague prayers, and it is applied to the prayers XXI 19 and 27, and VI 45+46, as well as to numerous lesser addresses to the gods. The verb differs fundamentally from *muga-* in that the person addressed is regularly in the dative. The primary meaning is perhaps 'present oneself' (*BoSt.* 10 40).

Thus the etymological connexion with such intransitive verbs as Gk. *μύζω* 'moan,' Lat. *mūgio* 'roar,' suggested by Zimmern in *Streiberg Festgabe* 438 and Mudge in *Lang.* VII 253, must be regarded as very problematical.

A few texts must now be mentioned which might appear to conflict with this translation :

VBoT 58, entitled [I DUP ?] *D²UTU²-ya-aš D²Te-li-pi-nu-ya-aš-ša mu-ga-a-u-ya-aš QA-TI* (IV 13). This text as preserved contains only the myth in which Telipinu goes out to search for the lost Sun-god (col. I), and some very obscure lines at the beginning of col. IV. But cf. IV 8 ff. : *ma-a-an-ša-an D²Te-li-pi-nu-ša ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki na-ak-ki-eš-zi ú-ga DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ud[-da-a-ar ?] [me-]ma-aš-ḫi ta-an mu-ga-mi* 'if Telipinu becomes heavy upon anyone,¹ I speak the word (?) of the gods and entreat him.' Evidently the myth in col. I is the 'word of the gods,' and we may suppose that the 'entreaty' followed in col. II or III.

XVII 23 I 1 : [*ma*]-*aḫ-ḫa-an-kán SALŠU.GI mu-ga-u-ya-an-zi* (2) *aš-nu-zi* 'when the old wife prepares to *mugā*-' The tablet as preserved contains offerings and ceremonies but no prayer. But all the reverse is lost, and in any case these are only the 'preparations.'

XX 1 II 33 : [^{D^U}] *mu-u-ya-nu-un ku-e-da-aš É-na-aš an-da mu-ga-an-zi* (34) [] *a-pi-ia an-da pi-e-da-an-zi* 'they take [it ?/him ?] into the house in which they *muga*- the Weather-god *muyan*-' This text also contains no prayer; but this sentence does not imply that the *mugayar* was contained on the tablet. Note that in III 13 the ritual of KAS-az *ḫyittiḫayar* is mentioned.

XXVII 16 III 14 : *nu SALLUGAL DINANNA URUNi-nu-ya I-NA UD III.KAM ki-iš-ša-an* (15) *mu-ki-eš-ki-iz-zi* 'and the queen entreats Ištar of Nineveh thus for three days.' The following lines show that *kiššan* here is anaphoric; therefore the *mugayar* must have been described in the previous part of the tablet, although like the three preceding texts this contains only offerings. Here, then, it is necessary to assume that a prayer was contained in the lost second column. That the *mugayar* was essentially audible is shown (in case the foregoing evidence is thought inconclusive) by C I 38 : [*mu-g*]*a-u-ya-ar-ra zi-ik-pit iš-ta-ma-aš-ki-ši*.

1. Cf. Götze, *KlF.* I 181.

We have seen that the published texts consistently demand for the verb *mugā-* the meaning 'entreat,' for *mugayar* 'prayer'—especially the 'evocatio' type of prayer which is represented by our text A+B (for *mugeššar* see below, p. 60).

Why, then, did the Hittite lexicographer choose *mugayar* to explain the Accadian word *ta-zi-im-tu* in III 103 5? The verb *nazāmu* occurs in the letters in the sense 'complain, grumble (about)';¹ *tazzimtu* = 'complaint, murmuring, discontent,'² and is essentially an evil which should be avoided or suppressed.³ Thus both the verb and the noun have quite different associations from *muga-* and *mugayar*. It is possible that the scribe knew only the Accadian vocabularies in which *tazzimtum* is given with *takribtum* 'prayer' as the equivalent of Sum. ÉR. But Götze in *KlF.* I 188 has shown that this section of III 103, where the Sumerian column is broken off, was most probably concerned with the sign KA, and this suggests a different explanation. In the rituals of the new year at Babylon the Accadians used a type of prayer closely resembling that which the Hittites called *mugayar* (see Thureau-Dangin, *Rituel Accadien*, 129 ff.); these prayers are termed *ikribu*, and the ideogram for this is SUB, i.e. KA×ŠU. If this sign stood in III 103 5, *mugayar* would be a very accurate rendering. It is true that *tazzimtum* is nowhere given as the translation of SUB. But a word *ta-zi-im-tum* approximately equivalent to *tašmertum* 'desire' (so, not *tazmertum*, from *zamāru*, according to Landsberger, *ZA NF III* 90⁶) is attested in II R 47 29b, where both words have the same ideogram, and in the phrase *tazimtu kašādu* (Sidney Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts*, 84.10, cf. Landsberger, *loc. cit.*). This word may well have meant 'prayer' rather than 'desire'; and the fact that in II R 47 29b its ideogram is not ÉR or I.AN.UD but KA.AN.MU.GÁL suggests that it is a different word from *tazzimtu* 'complaint.' It is in fact this ideogram, not SUB, which Götze himself (*loc. cit.*) supposes to have stood in *KUB III* 103 5. In either case it seems that the line can best be explained by supposing that it was this second *tazimtu* which the Hittite lexicographer had in mind.

1. *tu-na-za-mi-in-ni* 'thou complainest of me' (Landsberger, *ZDMG LXIX* 514-15). *la ut-ta-(az-)za-am* 'he shall not grumble' (Knudtzon, *VAB II* 27.15, 29.157, 171).

2. See the passages from the Epic of Gilgamesh and others cited by Muss-Arnolt s.v.

3. Its ideogram I.AN.UD (I DUTU?) also = *habālu* 'injure, wrong' in *RA XVII* 199 22a; and in *Ur Exc. Texts I* 111 25 this Sumerian word denotes something to be expelled. In Virolleaud *Sin XXXIII* 61 it is parallel to *nukurtu* 'hostility,' see Weidner in *Riv. d. Stud. Or.* IX 470-1.

B I 9=A I 10. *uḫanna*. Cf. ANŠU.KUR.RA.MEŠ *uḫannaš/ueḫunnaš* in *KBo.* VI 28 rev. 25 // XXVI 58 obv. 10 (*ap.* Götze, *NBr.* 54 f.), evidently denoting a special type of horse. Götze renders 'Zugpferde' draught-horses, but here *uḫ-* is an activity conducted in the mountains, which suggests either 'hunt' or 'ride.' This is to assume, of course, that there is a connexion with the horses mentioned above; from the present passage alone a colourless meaning such as 'taking a turn in the mountains' is perfectly possible. The only actual example of hunting is in the Anitta text, 60-3 (Hrozný, *Arch. Or.* I 273 ff.; Götze, *Kultur.* 87). Sommer points out (*AU* 90¹) that riding is mentioned in VII 25 I 6-9 and X 3 I 11. For the whole passage, cf. *KBo.* II 9 I 15 f., VII 5 I 13 ff., and XV 34 I 50 ff. (Zuntz, *TIS* 20); also the words of Elijah in 1 Kings xviii. 27.

The participle *pānza* must here have a perfect sense, since *pa(i)-* means strictly 'start on a journey' as opposed to *uḫa-* 'come, arrive at one's destination' (see Sturtevant, *HGr.* §§ 115, 301; a good example is XXV 14 I 8, 9, 18). This is an instance of the rule now established by Bechtel, *Hittite Verbs* 103: 'if the verb denotes an activity, the participle normally denotes the situation resulting from that activity: that is, its function is that represented by the term "perfect".'

B I 10=A I 11. *šanezzi*='excellent, first class' (Ehelolf in *OLZ* 36 4 and 6). The form is that of a superlative, according to Ehelolf, *loc. cit.*, and Sommer *ap.* Götze, *Hatt.* 91, though Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 163, analyses the words in *-ziš* otherwise. The root *san-* is compared by Lohmann *IF* LI 325 ff., with Skt. *sanutár* 'far away,' *sánutya* 'on one side,' Av. *hanar* 'without,' Goth. *sundro* 'special,' etc., and Ehelolf, *ibid.* 326¹, thinks Hitt. *šanna-* 'conceal' may be connected. However, if Götze in *Lang.* XI 185-90 is right in deducing from the words *šannapi*, *šannapili-* and *šannapileš-* that **šana-* is the Hittite word for 'one' (which is probable, though not conclusively proved), that is almost certainly the base of *šanezzi-* also, as suggested by Sturtevant in *JAOS* LVI 282³.

uḫšulaš is certainly a verbal noun from the verb *uḫarš-*,¹ which means primarily 'move to and fro over,' hence (a) 'stroke, soothe,' (b) 'reap' a field, 'clear' a road. For its case see below.

1. The connexion is proved by XXVII 29 II 16 *šq-ni-iz-zi uḫ-ar-aš-ta*, and 'rest, refreshment' suits all the passages here quoted, except possibly *KBo.* III 5 IV 32, which is obscure in any case.

kalleš = 'summon, invite' to a feast, e.g. X 93 I 10, XVII 5 I 6, XX 88 VI 22. See also Zuntz, *TIS* 64 f.

Thus the meaning of the words individually is not in doubt, and the main problem of the sentence lies in the syntax. The questions that arise are: (i) Is *varšulaš* nom. or gen.? (ii) What is the construction of *GIŠERIN-an-za IĀ-an-za*?

(i) If the nom. sg. is **varšul*, as supposed by Götze in *KlF.* I 197, then *varšulaš* must be gen. sg. This was a very natural assumption since **varšul* would conform to a well-known type of action noun, and the only word then known to have formed an acc. in *-ulan* (and therefore a nom. in *-ulaš*?) under the influence of the *-a-* stems was *aššul* (Götze, *Hatt.* 66). But since Götze in *Mél. Ped.* 488 ff. (esp. 493) has shown that these analogical formations are very common in Hittite, the hypothesis that *varšulaš* is here nom. sg. presents no difficulty. It is certainly the natural assumption that *šanezziš* and *varšulaš* are in grammatical agreement both here and in XVII 10 II 7 (where the greater part of the line is lost). The nom. *varšulaš* is actually attested in XV 34 II 32: *GIŠERIN-aš-ma ya-ar-šu[-la]-aš GIŠ DINANNA-ia-aš ha-r[i]- . . .*. LÜAZU-aš *me?-mi?-ia?-aš?* (33) DINGIR.MEŠ-aš *kal-li-iš-tar . . .* *e-eš-du*, for here we have clearly three noms. each preceded by a dependent genitive.¹ The two passages from the treatise on horse-training² point in the same direction; for the dat. in *-ai* (*KBo.* III 2 obv. 11) is formed only from *-a-* and *-i-* stems, never from consonant stems (Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 195 a-f), and in *KBo.* III 5 IV 32, though the meaning is not clear, *varšulaš* must in some way contain the subject, and even Götze hesitates to analyse it as genitive. Further, we have the acc. *ya-ar-šu-la-an* in XXIV 14 I 22, though the sense is not clear. Elsewhere the gen. *ya-ar-šu-la-aš*³ and the dat. *ya-ar-šu-(ú)-li*⁴ might be from **varšul*. But the existence of the nom. *varšulaš* does not need further proof.

1. Zuntz, *TIS* 28, allows room for two signs between *šu* and *aš* in line 32, and it is true that *la* would not entirely fill the space as given in the copy. But comparison with the photograph, which I was able to examine through the courtesy of Prof. Ehelolf, has established the fact that the space in the copy is exaggerated. The restoration of *la* is therefore certain.

2. See Götze, *KlF.* I 197 with notes 2 and 3.

3. *VBoT* 53 I 11; *KUB* XII 65 rev. 21 is hopelessly broken.

4. With *eku* : *KBo.* IV 13 VI 6, *KUB* XX 99 III 21, XXV 32 III 28, 37 I 42, II 12, XXVII 12 5. Written *ya-ar-šu-liš* XVII 35 I 33, IV 32 (also with *eku*). Sommer, *HAB* 176 f., cites this as an example of superfluous *-s* after *-i*. But in the case of 'liš' the *-š* was evidently not pronounced, since we find (in this same text!) *hu-ul-hu-li(š)-ia* XVII 35 II 26, IV 34, and elsewhere *al-li(š)-aš* V 11 I 16, and *hi-li(š)-ip-ši-ma-an* XVIII 56 II 20. This is also Ehelolf's opinion (*ap. Sommer, ibid.* 177 fn. 2).

(ii) GIŠERIN-*an-za* IĀ-*an-za* might be either noms. or nasalized ablatives. So long as *ṽaršulaš* was supposed to be gen. from **ṽaršul*, the only possible translation of the sentence was 'Let excellent cedar and oil (nom.) of refreshment (gen.) summon thee.' But the order of the words is against this, and the close resemblance of the passage from XV 34 quoted above is surely decisive in favour of the other alternative. For *ṽaršulaš* is there clearly a product of GIŠERIN,¹ and the parallelism demands that the words should stand semantically in the same relation to each other here as there. The use of the abl. here for the more normal gen. in XV 34 II 32 can be explained by the verbal element in *ṽaršulaš*. It is impossible to take the ablatives with the verb *kallešdu* with the sense of instrumentals,² since they are the source of the refreshment, not the instrument of the invitation.

B I 11=A I 13. É*karimni*(-ti). This word is a neuter; nom. É*ka-ri-im-mi* (XIII 2 II 18, 29, 30), acc. É*ka-ri-im-me* (IX 2 I 2), see also on B I 16. The only occurrences of É*ka-ri-im-na-aš* known to me (XX 52 IV 10, XV 34 II 13) are dat./loc. pl. Hence, although the equation with É DINGIR-LIM was conclusively established by Ehelolf in ZA. NF. II 313 f., the further deduction that *karimn-* is a word for 'god' will not stand; nor is there any other evidence to support this, for *karimn-* never occurs without the preceding 'É,' and indeed it appears from ZA. NF. IX 181² that Ehelolf has since abandoned the idea himself. Either *karimn-* must be an adj. in agreement with É, or É must be determinative and *karimme* the whole word meaning 'temple.' The former alternative is adopted by Götze-Pedersen, MS 80 (and repeated in Sturtevant, HGL. 71); but the explanation there given is irrelevant because it depends on the supposition that *karimn-* = 'god,' and the authors were apparently unaware that É*karimme*/i is nom./acc. as well as dat./loc.³ The second alternative, on the other hand, is supported by the existence of a derivative LÜ*karim(ma)nalaš*⁴ equivalent to LÜ.É.DINGIR-LIM⁵; for these words are regularly formed from substantives, not adjectives (e.g. *ḫaršūḫalaš*,⁶ *išpantuzziḫalaš*, *taḫalalaš*, *ḫalḫiḫalaš*, *ḫattalḫalaš*). The use of É as determinative is not uncommon :

1. For cedar as an edible (?) offering see BoSt. 10 69.

2. Cf. Sommer, AU 81; Sturtevant, HGr. § 190.

3. Unless 'Lok. É *ka-ri-im-me*' is a misprint for 'Nom. É *ka-ri-im-me*.'

4. LÜ.MES*ka-ri-im-ma-n*a¹, XX 35 III 4; and *ḫa-ri-im-na-a-li-iš*, XXVII 51 6.

5. Compare XX 35 III 3-4 with XXVII 59 I 13 and 17.

6. Or is *ḫarši-* an adj.? See on B I 12.

cf. $\text{É}h\text{ilamna-}$,¹ $\text{É}h\text{alentuwa-}$,² and $\text{É}arzana-$.³ With the reading adopted $\text{É}karimn-$ falls into line with these words, and there is no reason to regard karimn- as an adj. until it is found in some other connexion.⁴ A similar problem is presented by 'NINDA' harši- , for which see following note.

B I 12=A I 14=C I 3. $\text{NINDA}har\dot{s}it$. Here again the question arises, whether, because 'NINDA' harši- = $\text{NINDA.KUR}_4\text{.RA}$ / NINDA.SI.DI , it follows that harši- = $\text{KUR}_4\text{.RA}$ / SI.DI 'ordinary.'

The evidence is extraordinarily puzzling. On the one hand, as Götze has pointed out in *KlF*. I 199 f., the formation of several cases from an extended stem haršai- gives harši- all the appearance of an adjective. But on the other hand it is clear that NINDA does not represent a separate Hittite word. For no space is left between NINDA and the following sign; and furthermore the enclitic particles invariably follow the whole expression when it stands at the beginning of a sentence, e.g. $\text{NINDA}har\text{-}\dot{s}a\text{-}i\text{-}ma\text{-}\dot{a}\text{-}\dot{s}a\text{-}an$ (VII 1 II 26), $\text{NINDA}har\text{-}\dot{s}i\text{-}\dot{i}\dot{s}\text{-}\dot{s}a$ (XI 23 VI 2), [NINDA] $\text{har}\text{-}\dot{s}i\text{-}in\text{-}mu$ (XII 17 3). I cannot therefore follow Götze in writing $\text{NINDA } har\dot{s}i-$, but transcribe the sign as determinative.

Thus $\text{NINDA}har\dot{s}i-$ is the name of this kind of bread or food, and harši- can hardly be anything but a substantive.⁵ It may be supposed that an original adjective came to be used as a substantive: Sommer, *HAB* 65¹, considers this possible. But if the word were really an adjective meaning 'ordinary, regular' we should expect to find it in other connexions. Götze finds support of this kind in the phrase 'DUG' $\text{har}\text{-}\dot{s}i$, in which he sees the same adjective. The evidence for this expression has therefore been examined: see pp. 120 ff.; but it will be seen that it cannot be explained in this way. Thus the only reason for supposing harši- to have been even originally an adjective is the formation of the stem, and this is very weak evidence.

B I 12=A I 14. $\text{DUGi}\dot{s}pantuzzi$ is a vessel containing wine, used metaphorically for the ration of wine which it contained: see Sommer, *HAB* 171 f., and for the suffix *-uzzi* forming instrument-nouns, Sturtevant,

1. Götze, *AM* 204¹.

2. Friedrich, *ZA*. NF. III 177 f.

3. *KEO*. V 6 I 16; but *I-NA É ar-za-na-aš*, 396/d 11, see Ehelolf, *ZA*. NF. IX 185.

4. DINGIR.MEŠ-mu-uš is now interpreted by Ehelolf as $=\dot{s}iv\dot{u}š$ (*ZA*. NF. IX 181²). Pedersen, *MS*. 80, draws attention to an 'acc. pl.' DINGIR.LUM-ma-aš in XVII 35 III 8, 35 (also I 33, II 26, IV 13). But in all surrounding lines the god (=cult-image) is sing.; hence this cannot be a case-form.

5. The derivative substantive $\text{har}\dot{s}i\dot{y}alaš$ lends support to this view: see previous note.

HGr. § 164. It is not permissible to interpret the word as *spantuzi* and to connect it with *šipant-* 'libate' (so Sturtevant, *loc. cit.*), for the spelling of the two words with *iš-* and *ši-* respectively is invariable, and the vessel is not used for libating, but for the procedure denoted by *eku*.¹

The equation with (DUG)GAL 'bowl (?)'² maintained by Sturtevant in *JAOS* LIV 400 (in *HGl.* 67 modified by 'sometimes') does not by any means follow from XIII 4 I 62 ff. In line 64 f. we have the stereotyped phrase NINDA³harši- DUGiš⁴spantuzzi- which everywhere stands for the food and drink-offerings, whereas in 62 the phrase GEŠTIN IŠTU GAL-⁵ia 'and(?) wine from a GAL' shows that the wine is to be offered by means of a GAL.² Furthermore GAL is always masc., as may be seen not only from the common acc. GAL-in³ but also from the pronouns na-an (XVII 24 III 12-14; -at in 15-16 probably refers to the contents šieššar), [ku²]-u-un (XXVIII 5 rev. 13), ku-in (XV 42 II 2), a-pu-u-un (XV 42 II 5), pl. na-aš (KBo. II 4 II 10). How the mysterious GAL-'ri' is to be reconciled with this is not clear, since it also is obviously acc. in II 3 II 44, X 7 9, XXVIII 104 IV 10, 13 (=XXV 7 I 7, 9, =VBoT 127 5)⁴: cf. Sommer, *HAB* 172¹. But for this, there would be no reason to suppose that (DUG)GAL is not to be read simply šalli-.⁵

B I 13=A I 15=C I 4. *parā kalānkanza*. Zuntz, *TIS* 53 f., shows that *galaktar* most probably means 'food' in general, and suggests that *kalankanza* is cognate with it. This is practically certain in view of the juxtaposition of the two words in XVII 10 II 12 f., and *kalankanza* will then mean 'fed, nourished.' The preverb *parā* is most naturally taken as giving the verb a terminative sense. The compound will then fall into place in Dr. Zuntz's classification under *parā* C 2 (*Ortsadv.* 74).

B I 14=A I 16 f. *ištamanan lagān hark*. The translation 'hold thine ear inclined to me' is not intended to imply that *lagān* is in agreement with *ištamanan*, for, as Prof. Ehelolf has pointed out to me, in this common phrase the participle is neuter while the subst. is masc., *lagān hark* must therefore be interpreted as a periphrastic perfect

1. Except VII 60 III 9 ff., where however the word is (abl.) DUGiš⁴spantuyaz, not DUGiš⁴spantuzzi²az. See Sommer, *HAB* 171.

2. Not 'vat' as one might suppose from the name. Two of the clearest instances showing that GAL is a libation cup or bowl are X 11 V 1 f. and XI 21 V 16 ff., quoted on p. 123.

3. XII 52 III 9, XIII 3 II 26, XXV 1 V 52, 36 II 20, VBoT 133 obv. 5.

4. GAL-ri-ja is apparently dat.-loc. in VBoT 58 I 39. But the meaning seems there to be different.

5. Cf. Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10 37 f.

(Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 439). The perfect, which describes a state of things as a result of past activity, cannot logically be used in the imperative, i.e. for an action that has not yet begun, but the perf. imp. is used in practice for an injunction to get into a certain condition, to begin an action and continue in it (cf. Gk. *οἷσθα*). Another example is *TI-an har-ak* in A III 4.

B I 16=A I 19. Accad. *Ū*, which strictly has only the meaning 'and,' here seems to represent Hitt. *-a* 'also.'

B I 16=A I 20=C I 7. *d/taš(ša)nuyan*. This word is derived from *d/taššu-š* 'strong, heavy' (=Sum. *Á.GÁL*, Accad. *KA[B-TU]*, *KBo.* I 42 I 9) in accordance with the rule that adjectives in *-i* or *-u* lose their stem vowel before the suffix *-nu*: see Sommer, *AU.* 55 and Götze, *AM.* 253. The verb occurs in the imp. midd. *ta-aš-ša-nu-uḫ-hu-ut*, XXIII 77 35, in a mutilated passage, and the dur.-distr. form *da-aš-ša-nu-uš-ki-it-ten* is found in XXI 42 II 7, where a meaning 'make strong, consolidate' is also satisfactory.

The use of sing. *daššanuyan* with the pl. *É.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ* is an example of the notorious irregularity of Hittite in the treatment of neuters and collectives, for which see Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10.31, 48, 52, etc. Cf. sing. *ešzi* with plurals in A I 26, 27, II 2, 6.

B I 18 f.=A I 22 (=C I 10). Here again the adjectives *parkui* (*šuppi*) are singular in spite of the plurals *EZEN.ḪI.A SISKUR.ḪI.A*, the latter word representing the Hittite neuter *aniur* (Götze, *AM* 226). The Hittite reading for *EZEN* is not neuter (see on A II 3); but the attraction of a predicate or attribute to the last of a row of co-ordinated substantives (zeugma) is by no means abnormal.

The verb *piškanzi* also belongs properly only to *SISKUR*, for one cannot 'offer' a ceremony. The proper verb for *EZEN* is *iā-* (or *ešša-*) 'perform,' and it may be observed that *iā-* can be used with *SISKUR* also (e.g. XVII 28 III 18 f., IV 56, *KlF.* I 172 II 18), just as in English one can both offer and perform a sacrifice.

A II 1. BIBRIḪI.A. This vessel, the filling of which was equivalent to a libation,¹ might be made in the form of various animals, e.g. lion,²

1. See Götze, *Kultur.* 158-9.

2. *KBo.* IV 13 VI 1, *KUB* I 17 V 28, X 89 I 20, XXVIII I IV 22.

ox,¹ or 'mountain sheep'²; hence the translation 'rhyton.' For such theriomorphic vessels see de Genouillac, *Céramique Cappadocienne*, I 31-3.

A II 1. KUG UD≡GI seems to be an abbreviation for KUG UD KUG GI both here and in IV 2; here, however, KUBABBAR is also written. See also note on A II 19.

A II 3. EZEN.ĤI.A-*it-ta* shows that EZEN conceals a word ending in -i, which if Hittite can only be neut. pl.: see Götze, *AM* 223. But EZEN is regularly masc.: nom. EZEN-aš, XIII 4 I 45; acc. EZEN-an, *KBo.* III 7 I 14, *KUB* XI 27 VI 7, XVII 10 I 19, XXII 27 III 38; predicate *bandanza*, XVII 35 III 20; pronouns -aš, -an, XIV 4 III 24 ff. Can it be that the scribe was thinking of *ISINNI*? This would cause no difficulty to those who believe with Forrer that many Accadian words are to be read as they stand and not as ideograms.³

A II 3=C I 16. MU(-aš?) *mejanaš*, MU-TI *mijanaš*. That this is a period of time is agreed by Götze (*MS.* 19) and Ehelolf (*ZA.* NF. IX 182, and *ap.* Boissier, *MBMH* 22 f.); but whereas Götze thinks it may be a period longer than a year, Ehelolf suggests the meaning 'half-year.' That it is a period longer than a month is clear from the sequence UD-aš ITU-aš? MU-TI *me-ia-ni-ia-aš* in XVII 21 I 21 and III 14, but the remainder of the passages cited by Ehelolf throw no further light on the matter.

Now the fragment XXVII 68, though not actually containing our expression, opens suggestively as follows:

- (1) A?-NA? D[U URUZa-*h*]a-lu-ka₄ 12 EZEN ITU.KAM 2 E[ZEN . . .
(2) 1 EZEN *zé-e-ni*? 1 EZEN (. . ?) ŠIBIR, etc. etc.

We have here twelve monthly festivals, one festival of the autumn and one festival of the harvest. This is therefore a list of the festivals to be celebrated during one year, and the festival which is broken off at the end of line 1 occurred twice in the year. Considering the frequent association of the EZEN MU-TI *mejanaš* with the EZEN ITU.KAM one cannot help concluding that this is the festival in question. If so, Ehelolf's interpretation is proved.

Ehelolf (*loc. cit.*) has pointed out that MU-'*ti*' *mejani* is equivalent

1. *KBo.* IV 13 VI 18, *KUB* I 17 II 33, II 10 I 27, XII 1 IV 20 ff.

2. XII 1 IV 10 f.

3. The sing. verb *ešzi* (if correct—see below on A II 6) cannot be used as evidence for the reading of EZEN.ĤI.A, since it might occur with any 'collective' written ideographically: see Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10.31, 52.

to *yitti meḡani*, IV 72 rev. 2. But since MU-*ti meḡanaš* would require a different syntax and *yitti meḡanaš* does not to my knowledge occur, I prefer in this case, pending further evidence, to transcribe MU-TI (=ŠATTI). This would indeed be proved if the small 'aš' which follows MU in text A were clearly intentional, for the word for 'year' would then be in the gen. as we should expect; but the sign appears to be erased.

It seems from XXVII 1 I 20-2 that the festival was specially suitable for years in which there had been no campaigning.

A II 5=C I 18. *auliuš*. A noun *auli-* is well attested: nom. *a-ú-li-iš*, XV 28 II 3, UZU *a-ú-li-iš*, XXVII 66 III 2, 13; acc. s. *a-ú-li-in/en*, II 8 III 8, XV 28 II 2, XXII 61 I 11; dat./loc. s. *a-ú-li(-ia)*, II 8 III 13, 15; acc. pl. (?) UZU *a-ú-li-iš*, XVII 24 III 4 (see Götzke, NBr. 77b). In the two passages with determinative UZU it is clearly a piece of sacrificial meat. In all other passages the meaning is uncertain, mostly owing to mutilation of the text.

If the present form *a-ú-li-uš* is derived from this word, it must be accusative plural. Von Brandenstein in *Orientalia*, 1939, 78² supposes it to be governed by the verbal element in *mukišnaš* and translates 'lamentation for the stags.' But *mukeššar* is essentially a substantive (see following note), and the verb *mugā-*, as shown on pp. 45 ff., means not 'lament' but 'beseech,' which would give an impossible sense in such a phrase. Nor is it likely in this context to be the direct object of *eššanzi*. In view of the surrounding genitives it is more probably one of the genitives in *-uš*; and since these are always contracted forms from *-u-* stems¹ we must posit a stem *auliu-* for this word and separate it from (UZU)*auli-*.

As regards the meaning, there can be little doubt that we have the same word in C II 11 UDU *a-ú-li-ú-uš(-kán)* and C II 15 UDU *a-ú-li-uš(-ša)* (both probably nom. pl.) and in XVII 21 II 18 *a-ú-li-ú-š(a-kán)* (acc. pl.). Therefore *auliu-* is an animal, and von Brandenstein (*loc. cit.*) has compared the present passage with the similar list of festivals in XIII 4 I 39, where an EZEN '*a-ia-li*' is mentioned; in this he sees the Accadian word *AIALU* 'stag' and suggests that *auliu-*² may be a loan-word

1. Sommer, *BoSt.* VII 17; Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 194. Also SISKUR *ki-i-lu-uš* (HT 1 II 15=IX 31 II 42) // SISKUR *ki-la-u-ya-aš* (IX 31 IV 43); and *ya-ap-pu-uš* (Bo. 2072 I 21, *ap.* Forrer, *RHA* I 146).

2. Von Brandenstein reads *auli-* and translates (UZU)*auli-* in the passages quoted above 'stag's meat.'

from this. But even if the interpretation of *AIALU* as 'stag' is correct, which is very doubtful,¹ the equation with *auliu-* involves unusual phonetic changes, and could only be proved by much more cogent evidence than the parallelism of these two passages. In fact the evidence for *auliu-* points in another direction. The words ^{UDU}*auliuš* GUD.ḪI.A UDU.ḪI.A in C II 11 are taken up in line 15 by the single word ^{UDU}*auliuš*, which suggests that this is a generic term under which the oxen and sheep are subsumed. This is supported by XVII 21 II 18, where the word again precedes a list of animals, namely GUD.MAH.ḪI.A.ŠE GUD.ĀB.ŠE UDU.ḪI.A.ŠE MÁŠ.GAL.ḪI.A.ŠE. The latter list moreover seems to show that *auliu-* denotes fat animals; and it will be seen ² that C II 11-15 is closely associated with XIII 4 IV 56 ff., a passage which is also concerned with fattened animals intended for sacrifice. If this fattening implies castration, as supposed by Sommer and Sturtevant,² then *auliu-* will mean 'castrated animal,' and its counterpart is perhaps to be seen in ^{UDU}*ižanza*, for which Götze (*ap. Sturtevant, Chrest.* 123) has already suggested the translation 'unblemished.'

mukišnaš. The word is preserved only on A, but is certainly to be restored in C. Thus we learn that the festival of *mukeššar*³ was celebrated in honour of Telipinu and the Sun-goddess (or Sun-god) of Arinna. This festival is mentioned also in XII 19 II 11.

The noun is formed in the regular way ⁴ from *mugā-* 'entreat' (for which see above). That it has the same associations as the verb is shown by its occurrence in VII 5 IV 17 and *VBoT* 24 IV 17. The former text has been described above, p. 48 under no. iv. *VBoT* 24 (see Sturtevant, *Chrest.* 100 ff.) contains two rituals; but we are concerned here only with the second of these, which begins at III 4. This ritual has a strong likeness to *KUB* XV 34 (p. 47 no. iii). We may notice especially the verb *ḫiḫa(i)-* 'entice (?)' in the title: I SISKUR *ma-a-an* ^DLAMA KUŠ*kur-ša-an ú-i-ja-an-zi* (IV 36-7) and also in III 35 and IV 14; and the use of the ^{TUG}*kureššar*, ^{ŠIG}*ḫutulli* and other objects in III 6 ff., parallel to the beginning of XV 34. The similarity has been pointed

1. It is true that stags are attested in the Hittite texts in the ideographic LU.LI. IM.MEŠ of XV 22 12 (Landsberger, *Fauna*, p. 98). But the Accadian reading of this is *lulimu*, not *ajalu*. Of course the Hittites might have used both words. But in the sequence 'festival of the month, festival of the year, *ajali*-festival, festival of the autumn, festival of the spring' we should expect *ajali* rather to be a period of time, or a season.

2. See note on *karškir* C II 12 (pp. 85 ff.).

3. The word is always spelt with *-ki-* or *-kiš-*, never with *-gi-*.

4. See Götze, *Madd.* 62 f.

out by Zuntz, *TIS* 7. The prayer is here much briefer (III 37-45), but it contains the essential request for favour.

In both the passages just quoted *mukeššar* denotes the numerous objects and offerings used in the ritual; for in VII 5 IV 17 a table stands ready for it, and in *VBoT* 24 IV 17 'all the *mukeššar*' (*mu-ki-eš-šar lu-u-ma-an*) is picked up and carried out. In view of the formation of the word, this can only be explained if *mukeššar* is the whole ritual of 'entreaty' regarded objectively, including all its paraphernalia. It is this noun, not *mugayar*, which occurs very commonly in the KIN oracles among other concrete and abstract (but not verbal) nouns. Perhaps also this is why in V 6 III 73, (77), XVIII 62 7 and XXII 40 III 20 the verb used with *mukeššar* is *dai* 'puts'; though it must be pointed out that *arku_uyar* 'prayer' is also used with this verb in V 1 II 109, VI 45 IV 53, XV 22 3, XXII 57 obv. 14 (*VBoT* 121 10 ?). In V 6 II 34 the *mukeššar* is read from a tablet.¹

Thus in *mukeššar* the substantival element is more prominent than the verbal, and this is true of all nouns in *-šar* and *-tar* as compared with the corresponding nouns in *-yar*, as may be seen from the list of such forms given by Götze, *Madd.* 62-3.

Special mention must be made here of the interesting passage quoted by Ehelolf in *MDOG* 75 68 from Bo. 2805, where the bringing home of bones of one who has died abroad is followed by 'days of *mukišnaš*' and sacrifices. The context here strongly suggests 'lamentation,' but in view of the consistent evidence of all other texts, as shown on pp. 45 ff., this must be doubted. Perhaps the ritual was intended to attract the soul of the dead man from the place of his death.

A II 6 *ešzi*=C I 19 *eššanzi*; *eššanzi* also in A II 8. In view of C II 39 *e-eš-šir* all these forms might come from *eš* 'to be'; but the spelling with *e-eš* would be even more remarkable with the 3 pl. pres., where the regular form is *a-ša-an-zi*, than with the 3 pl. pret. which is normally *e-šir/še-ir*. In fact *eššanzi* is certainly from *eššā* (the regular verb with feasts, see on B I 18 f.). *ešzi* is not impossible (see p. 58 fn. 3), but may be a mistake due to the influence of previous lines.

A II 9: DINGIR.MEŠ-*tar* = C I 21: DINGIR-LIM-*ia-tar*. See Ehelolf, *ZA*. NF. IX 177¹, 179.

1. See Sommer, *AU* 281.

A II 10=C I 22. *nakkīyah-* elsewhere (*KBo.* IV 6 I 26, *KlF.* I 261.4) is used only in the bad sense and always in the med.-pass.=*nakkeš-*, lit. 'be made heavy,' hence 'be oppressive, weigh heavily.' Here the sense 'revered' is clear from the context. Cf. Götze, *Hatt.* 94.

A II 10 ff. : *nu-ut-ták-kán.* -*ta* is here dat.-loc. ; see Sommer, *AU* 94¹.
For the omission of the queen and the princes see above, p. 44.

A II 13 ff.=C I 23 ff. : *himmuš*. The evidence for this word has multiplied greatly since Friedrich in *ZA.* NF. I 168 and 187 suggested the equation with IMŠU.GAR.RIN.NA 'oven.' It is entered in Sturtevant's *HGl.*, on the strength of the present passage as a kind of sacrifice. Now we have here three accusatives and two verbs, *iḫayanzi* and *šarā tittanuyanzi*. If some or all of these nouns are governed by *iḫa-*, they must be classed as ceremonies ; if however they are governed by *šarā tittanu-*, they are regarded as offerings, as we may see from *KlF.* I 244 26, where this verb has the object NINDAḫaršin DUGiṣpantuzzin, with the evident meaning 'set up, set forth.'¹ Götze's translation is indeed unobjectionable, since, as we have remarked above on B I 18, a sacrifice may be both a ceremony and an offering. Whether *himma-* also can be both depends in the first place on the construction of this sentence.

The possibilities are as follows :

- (1) *himmuš* (or *himmuš* and SISKUR.SISKUR.ḪI.A) with *šarā tittanuyanzi*, EZEN.ḪI.A (or SISKUR.SISKUR.ḪI.A EZEN.ḪI.A) with *iḫayanzi* 'they set up *himma*-offerings in order to perform ceremonies.'
- (2) All three nouns with *iḫayanzi* and this whole infinitive clause as object of *šarā tittanuyanzi*, the construction being analogous to that of the supine in -*yanzi* with such verbs as *zinna*.²
- (3) All three nouns with *šarā tittanuyanzi* ; *iḫayanzi* epexegetic 'in order to perform (them).'

No. 1 is in accordance with the known meaning of *šarā tittanu-* as shown above, but the separation of one noun from the other two is unnatural. No. 3 is unlikely ; for although there are analogies for the

1. The use of SISKUR.SISKUR.ḪI.A EZEN.ḪI.A with *šarā tittanu-* in XVII 21 I 21-23 may be due to zeugma, the verb belonging properly to the first substantive only.

2. E.g. *HT* I I 35 : *mān memiḫayazi zinizzi*, when 'he finishes speaking.'

zeugma involved¹ and for the isolation of the supine,² there would be no reason in this particular case for the addition of *iṣayanzi*, since the sense is complete without it.

No. 2 would seem to be excluded by the fact that *šarā tittanu-* is not, like *zinna-*, a verb of the kind which can take a procedure as its object. Apart from this, however, the construction is natural, and it happens that the passages XXIX 4 I 6-8 and 12 now provide evidence for such a usage:

6-8 *A-NA DINGIR-LIM-ma a-ni-u-ur-še-it ma-aḥ-ḥa-an na-an
a-ni-ia-u-ya-zi QA-TAM-MA ša-ra-a ti-it-ta-nu-ya-an-zi*

Here *na-an* is plainly the object of *aniṣayanzi*, and the only object that remains for *šarā tittanuyanzi* is the whole infinitive clause. The same is true of line 12:

na-aš i-ia-u-an-zi QA-TAM-MA ša-ra-a ti-it-ta-nu-ya-an-zi.

In the former case we expect a simple *a-ni-ia-an-zi*, in the latter *i-ia-an-zi*; the addition of *šarā tittanuyanzi* seems to introduce a mere difference of aspect.

This throws an entirely new light on the meaning of the verb *šarā tittanu-*. What, then, is the link between the common literal meaning 'put up' and this usage with the 'supine'? Another passage containing a figurative use of the verb is XV 3 I 7 ff.:

MU.KAM.ḪI.A-ya *ku-i-e-eš IŠ-TU DINGIR-LIM da-ra-an-te-eš
[ma-a-an?] UGU ti-it-ta-nu-zi nu A-NA DINGIR-LIM
pi-iḥ-ḥi*

'The years which have been promised by the god,—[if?] he s (them?), I will give (various objects) to the god.'

The subject of *tittanuzi* here may be either the god or the king to whom the years are promised. But the latter is more probable, since the verb would then have the meaning 'accomplish (a course)' which it is known to have in the horse-training texts.³ The verb was therefore sufficiently familiar in this sense to be so used in a metaphorical context, and we may perhaps suppose that it came to be used with the supine in the sense 'carry out' the procedure indicated.⁴ This would suit the present passage as well as those from XXIX 1.

1. See p. 62 fn. 1.

2. See Götze, *MS* 27-8.

3. See Hrozný, *AOr.* III 442.42, 456.46.

4. The verb probably has this sense also in XIII 2 III 2 and in XVII 21 I 21-23, which was cited above (p. 62 fn. 1) as a possible instance of zeugma.

It is certain then that no. 2 is the correct analysis of this sentence, and that all three nouns are governed by *īāyanzi*. There is therefore a strong presumption that *himma-* is a ceremony; but this is not absolutely necessary, on account of the possibility of zeugma. Now Professor Ehelolf has kindly placed at my disposal all his copies of unpublished material containing this word, for which I owe him a special debt of gratitude; and this material, together with that already published, is sufficient to prove almost conclusively the existence of a ceremony called *himma-*. The texts are also fairly enlightening with regard to the nature of this ceremony. Nevertheless the word has other meanings, and it is probable that it originally denoted some offering or other concrete object which cannot yet be determined.

In the first place we have three passages where *himma-* occurs as the object of the verb *īā-* in the middle of a ritual, where it seems to be a question not of making but of doing:

- (i) HT 1 I 38 ff.: UZUNÍG.GIG UZUŠĀ (39) *hū-i-šu ū-da-an-zi na-at (A-NA)*¹ EN É-TIM (40) *A-NA DINGIR-LIM pa-ra-a e-ip-zi nam-ma-kán ya-a-ki hi-im-ma-an* (41) *i-īa-an-zi A-NA GIA.DA.GUR-īa-aš-ša-an pu-u-ri-in* (42) *da-a-i nu pa-a-ši nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-a-i* (43) *ka-a-ša DAMAR.UD DIn-na-ra-u ya-an-te-eš-ša li-en-ga-u-en* (44) *na-aš-ta IŠ-TU UZUNÍG.GIG hū-u-i-ša-ya-az ya-a-ku-e-en* (45) *I-za?-ma?-kán*² GIA.DA.GUR-az *e-ku-e-en*. 'They bring the liver (?)³ and the heart raw, and the master of the house offers it to the god and then bites it; they make (or perform) a *himma-*,⁴ and he puts a *pūri-*⁵

1. Wrongly inserted by the scribe and omitted in the duplicate IX 31 I 48. Cf. C II 35.

2. I have collated the tablet at this point, and this seems to be the reading. The *I* and the *za* are certain, though there seem to be indistinct traces between them, which might conceivably be joined to the 'za' to form another sign; the third sign is not clear in the centre, but is elongated, like *ma* rather than *ku*. This is also Schwartz's reading in JAOS LVIII 338. Certainly an abl. of the numeral 1 is grammatically possible; the difficulty is that this abl. is elsewhere invariably *I-e-da-az*. However, most ablatives show a variation between final *-az* and *-za* (cf. Sturtevant, HGr. § 196 a-b), and a variant *I-za*, representing *I-e-da-za*, is therefore unobjectionable. Friedrich, AOr. VI 374, reads *nam-ma-kán*, but 'nam' is impossible.

3. See Sommer, HAB 78-83.

4. It is not entirely clear whether the phrase *himman īanzi* belongs with the act of eating which precedes it or with the act of drinking which follows it. The latter alternative has been adopted, because there is then a natural parallelism with the sentence beginning in 38 as regards the asyndesis and the verb in the 3 pl. Otherwise both these features are inexplicable.

5. The evidence for this perplexing word is as follows: (1) A vessel is taken from a *pūri-* (here always with det. ⁶¹⁸), HT 1 I 24 bis, KUB VII 1 III 34, 13 rev. 7, XXIV 13 I 20. (2) A *pūri-* is put on (?) to a vessel (always in published texts without ⁶¹⁸), as

on (? , -*šan*) the spoon (?) and sips (?) and speaks thus : ' Behold, Marduk (i.e. Santas)¹ and Innarayanteš-gods, we have sworn ; and we have bitten from the raw liver (?) and have drunk from one spoon (?) ''.'

(ii) Bo. 2819 II 4 ff. :

4 *ku-it-ma-an-ma* DINGIR.MEŠ *ar*-[

5 *ku-u-uš hi-im-mu-uš iš-ša-an-z[i*

6 *ar-ra-aš iš-ša-ma-i ha-ti-lí* [

' But when [they] . . . the gods,²

they make (or perform) these *himma*-s,³ [and the singer (?)]

sings *arraš*⁴ in Hattic.'

(iii) VBoT 116 13 :] *hi-im-ma-an i-en-[zi* ' they make (or perform) a *himmaš*.' Context largely destroyed.

Thus a phrase *himman iia-* is well established. Unfortunately, owing to the ambiguity of the verb *iia-*, it is not clear from this phrase whether *himma-* is a procedure or a concrete thing. For though the former seems more natural in the contexts, there are certain foods which are actually made during the course of rituals,⁵ and the latter cannot therefore be excluded.

There is in fact good evidence for a kind of food-offering NINDA *himmaš* :

(iv) XXVII 49 IV 7 :]NINDA *hi-im-ma-aš* [.

(v) XII 18 I 3 :]^{GIŠ}BAN]ŠUR.ĜI.A NINDA.ĜI.A *hi-im-ma-aš ú-da-i*.

(vi) Bo. 3162 II 9 :]^{GIŠ}BANŠUR.ĜI.A *ku-e ŠA* NINDA.ĜI.A *hi-im-ma-aš I-NA* [.

here, XX 16 I 6 (neg.), XXVII 69 II 13 (from a *tapišana-* of wine). (3) An appurtenance of a vessel, VBoT 58 IV 20 (III DUGKU-KU-UB . . . Ū III ^{GIŠ}pu-u-ri-ja-aš-mi-iš) and IX 28 I 14 (DUGKUR₄KUR₄aš . . . pu-u-ri-ja-aš-ša-aš). (4) A *pūri-* (or perhaps pl.) is put on (?) to horses which have finished eating, KUB I 13 I 23 (Hrozný, AÖr. III 440). (5) The king purifies himself (*tupūšša*) and wipes his *pūri-s* (*pu-u-ri-uš-šu[-uš]*), XX 59 I 17. (6) Obscure, XII 1 IV 21, 43 (*pūrin titālitaimēš/menzi*), XVII 16 I 8 ; mutilated, KBo. II 12 II 2, KUB XII 12 II 5, XV 31 IV 26, XXIX 10 II 4. One thinks of some kind of cover in (1)-(3) and some garment (perhaps the original meaning) in (5) ; Hrozný suggests ' muzzle ' in (4).

1. At least the name Santas is substituted in the Luwian sections : see Götze, *Kultur*. 127.

2. Or less probably ' But when the gods '

3. This phrase, referring presumably to a preceding description, shows that *himma*-s might be of various kinds.

4. *arraš* is known only as a part of the body ' anus.' Here it must be either the subject or the object of the verb *išhamai*. It seems more likely that it is a Hattic word denoting the song, like *ta-la-a-ja ta-la-a-ja-ta* in XI 32 III 16, IV 11 (quoted by Götze, *Madd.* 98 fn. 1), than that it is the name of a priest or singer.

5. See Sommer, *HAB* 172-3.

In all these instances no space is left between NINDA(.ĤI.A) and *himmaš*, which suggests that NINDA should be regarded as a determinative and *himmaš* as the actual name of the loaf or food. Against this is (a) the fact that only *hi-im-ma-aš* is attested in this phrase, even where it should be accusative, as in no. v, and (b) that there is apparently no single instance where NINDA as determinative is followed by a plural sign. But the interpretation of the phrase as 'food of *himma-*' is again consistent with the view that *himma-* itself is a ceremony. We may in any case justifiably infer that an essential part of this ceremony is food.

The following passages confirm the connexion with both food and drink suggested by nos. iv-vi and no. i respectively :

(vii) XXV 37 IV 16 ff. :

- 16 *a-ku-an-na-ma ĥu-u-da-ak a-d[a-an-na*
 17 *ku-u-uš-ma DINGIR.MEŠ DŪR-an-te-eš-pit . [.*
 18 *pí-eš-kán-zi NINDA.KUR₄.RA-ma ĥi-im-m[a-aš¹*

(viii) Bo. 694 rev. 1 ff. :

- 1 *pí-e- . . [.*
 2 *a-ku-ya-an-zi[i]*
 3 *ĥi-im-ma-aš-ma[.*
 4 *nu DUP.PÍ-az [.*

(ix) KUB IV 1 III 5 ff. :

- 5 *ma-a-an zi-in-n[a-i] na-aš EGIR-pa*
 6 *MA-ĤAR DINGIR.MEŠ URUĤa-at-t[i] pa-iz-zi*
 7 *nu UZUIA NINDA-an ar-ĥa a-da-an-zi*
 8 *nu DINGIR.MEŠ URUĤa-at-ti tu-uz-zi-ja-aš*
 9 *DIŠKUR-an DZA.MĀ.MĀ-an ši-ip-pa-an-za-ki-iz-zi*
 10 *ma-ši-ja-an-ki!² ma-aš-ma-aš a-aš-šu*
 11 *nu a-pi-ni-eš-šu-ya-an a-ku-ya-an-zi Ū-NU-UTĤIA*
 12 *ĥi-im-ma-aš KUŠ.UDU.ĤIA BE-EL DINGIR-LIM da-a-i*

'When he finishes, he goes back before the gods of Ĥatti; and they eat up the fat (and) the bread³; and he pours libations to the gods of Ĥatti, the Weather-god of the army, and

1. Probably 'ordinary bread of the *himma-*,' as in nos. iv-vi. The passage is too fragmentary to translate.

2. Ed. *te*. But see Götze, *NBr.* 35 f., and Sommer, *HAB* 165¹.

3. Or 'they feed (them) on the fat (and) the bread till it is all finished (*arĥa*).'¹ But see below, p. 68.

ZAMAMA; but as often as (seems) good to them,¹ so much (or often) they drink.² The "master of the god" takes the utensils of (the) *himma*- (and ?) the sheep-skins' (herewith end of ritual).

There is also a group of passages which should be compared closely together :

- (x) XXVII 66 II 13 // 60 13: A-NA LÚ.MEŠEN.DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia*
GIŠBANŠUR.ĤI.A *hi-im-ma-aš Ū-UL da-a-i* (14) *a-pi-e-da-ni*
UD-*ti ha-az-zi-ú-e* NU.GÁL *ku-ú-ki*

'She³ does not set (take ?) the tables of (the) *himma*-for (to ?) the "masters of the god"; on that day there is no *hazziye*' (on the latter see below).

- (xi) Bo. 260 rev. 3 :

3 *nam-ma hi-im-ma-aš* NU.GÁL . [.

4 *Ū-UL tar-ku-[ya-an-zi* (?)

5 UD III.KAM QA-TI [*>* <]

'Then there is no *himma*- [.

[They (?)] do not dance [.

The third day is finished.'

- (xii) XXVII 69 I 16: LÚ.MEŠALAN.KA×KÁR (?) *-ia* (17) *tar-ú-ú-eš-kán-zi* NINDA.KUR₄.RA NU.GÁL

'The statue-worshippers (?) dance⁴; there is no regular bread.'

- (xiii) KBo. II 8 I 30 // IV 21 // XXV 24 II 4 :

KÚ-*zi* NAG-*zi* (GAL.ĤI.A-*kán aš-ša-nu-ya-an-zi*)⁵ *ha-az-zi-ú-i*⁶
NU.GÁL

'They eat⁷ (and) drink.⁸ (They arrange the cups.)⁵ There is no *hazziye*.'

One has the impression (it is no more) that these four passages are all concerned with the same two items, namely :

(a) *himma*- / KÚ and NAG (= *ad*- and *aku*-) / NINDA.KUR₄.RA

(b) *hazziye* / *tarku*- or *taryesk*- 'dance.'⁴

Possibly *hazziye* also includes the various kinds of utterance which

1. A common use of *aššu*; cf. Götze, *NBr.* 35 f. Not 'as much as (is) good for them' (Sturtevant, *Lang.* X 272).

2. Or 'they give (them) to drink.' But see below, p. 68.

3. The *SALalhiitraš*: see preceding lines.

4. For *taryesk* = *tarku*- see Götze, *Lang.* XV 116-19. Sommer, *HAB* 42 f., suggested 'shout,' but the passages quoted by Götze are conclusive.

5. Clause added in *KBo.* II 8 IV 21.

6. XXV 24 II 4: *-ú-i*.

7. Or 'they give to eat.'

8. Or 'they give to drink.'

precede NINDA.KUR₄.RA NU.GÁL in XII 12 V 32 ff. and XXVII 69 IV 13.¹

Thus passages vii-xiii all tend to show that *himma-* stands for a ceremony consisting of the procedure *ad-+aku-*. The only one of these passages from which it is possible to decide whether these verbs are here transitive or intransitive is no. ix. Götze in *NBr.* 35 f. describes this as 'Trankspenden für Götter,' and certainly libations are poured to the gods in lines 8-9. But the verb is here in the sing., as in the first two lines, whereas both *adanzi* in 7 and *akuyanzi* in 11 are in the pl., and would seem therefore to refer to the congregation rather than to the priest. Hence the inference that the actions are of the same kind as that in line 9 is unjustified; and since both here and in all other passages quoted *adanzi* and *akuyanzi* stand alone without an object, the intransitive sense is to be preferred. The word *himma-* seems in fact to stand for a kind of communion feast shared with the deity. Such a sense would be especially suitable in no. i (see the translation of the whole text—unreliable in detail—by Schwartz in *JAOS* LVIII 334 ff.).

Nevertheless the proper meaning of *himma-* may as well be the food and drink used in this ceremony as the ceremony itself, just as NINDA.KUR₄.RA stands for the ceremony in no. xii; though it may be added that the phrase UNUT^{IIA} *himmaš* in no. ix is more naturally taken as utensils of a ceremony than as utensils of a food.

There remain four passages² of which I can give no very satisfactory explanation:

(xiv) 58/b obv. I 8 ff. (I rearrange the lines for convenience):

(8) II NINDA^{še-e-nu-uš} ZID.DA ZÍZ ŠA II UP-NI

IV NINDA^{ma-ri-e-eš} ZID.DA ZÍZ (9) ŠA III UP-NI

L NINDA^{še-e-nu-uš} ZID.DA ZÍZ TUR-TIM tar-na-aš

(10) XL NINDA^{ma-ri-e-eš} ZID.DA TUR-TIM tar-na-aš II-ŠU

IX NINDADUBBIN (11) ZID.DA ZÍZ TUR-TIM *hi-im-ma-aš*

1. That *hazziye* is some kind of entertainment has been mentioned by Götze, *Kulturg.* 152 with fn. 5. It is parallel with *duškaraz* in *KBo.* II 7 rev. 23 (on *duškaraz* 'joy' see p. 71). There are 'men of the *hazziye*' (*KBo.* II 8 III 10, IV 19, *KUB* XX 19 III 12), and 'women of the *hazziye*' (*KBo.* II 8 I 19, IV 22). Other refs.: *KBo.* II 8 IV 6; *KUB* XII 50 9, 63 rev. 1; XV 37 III 5, XVI 26 obv. 2, 4, rev. 1; XVIII 18 25, 25 I 9, 13, 26 II 5, 8, 9, 12; XXVII 68 I 11.

2. The word is also mentioned in *HT* 38 rev. 6 and 8, and a LÜ^{hi-im-ma-al-li-iš} occurs in 98/f. 4, both in mutilated texts.

Bo. 4045 and 85/d are fragmentary duplicates of this. The only natural inference from the passage is that *himma-* is a dry measure, parallel to *tarnaš* and *ŠA II/III UPNI* in the preceding clauses. Yet this is quite irreconcilable with the preceding evidence. It is necessary to suppose that *himma-* again indicates the purpose for which these foods are used, but such an interpretation is most unnatural.

(xv) Bo. 712 obv. (?) 2 ff.:

2-8 List of objects, including beds, baskets of small garments,
and three ox-horns of the king.

9 [.] *na-at É hi-im-ma-aš TUR-TIM*

10 [.] *IŠ-TU KAT an-da ka-ri-ia-an-zi*

= ' [They put ?] them (in ?) the house of the small *himma*'s (?)

[.] they cover [them ?] with a cloth.'

This is an entirely different context from anything previously cited; and if *TUR-TIM* really agrees with *hi-im-ma-aš*, it suggests that *himma-* is a concrete object. This recalls the hypothesis that *himma-* may have been properly a term for food and drink used in the communion feast. But it is unlikely that these objects should have been put in the 'house of the small cakes.' However, it is possible that the explanation would be apparent if the tablet were complete.

(xvi) Bo. 2660 I 5:

5 [.] . *KAK.ĪLA ZABAR II-ŠU VII-ŠU*

6 [.] . *-ga-li-ia-aš II ki-li-iš*

7 [.] *-ma-aš i-ia-an nu IM-aš ANŠU.KUR.RAMEŠ*

8 [.] . *-aš-ša-an II an-tu-uh-še-eš IM-aš*

9 [.] *ŠA? IM hi-im-ma-aš i-ia-an-za*

10 [.] *NA⁴ZA.GÌN NA⁴GUG NA⁴KÁ.DINGIR.RA*

11 [.] . *hu-ut-tu-ul-li ki-it-ta-ri*

If]*ma-aš* in 7 is the end of *hi-im-ma-aš*, as in 9, then *i-ia-an-za* in 9 cannot agree with *hi-im-ma-aš*; it seems that something is here made of *IM himmaš* (or even *IM^hhimmaš*) 'himma-clay,' as the horses and men are made of clay in lines 7-8. But what has clay to do with feasts and food?

(xvii) *KBo.* VI 34 III 36:

36 *nu-uš-ma-aš IMŠU.GAR.RIN.NA pi-ra-an kat-ta da-it-ti*

37 *GIŠAPIN-ia GIŠMAR.GID.DA GIŠGIGIR hi-im-ma-aš pi-ra-an*

38 *kat-ta da-it-ti na-at ar-ĥa du-ya-ar-na-an-zi*

This is the original passage from the 'soldier's oath,' from which Friedrich deduced his equation with IMŠU.GAR.RIN.NA. Let it be said in the first place that, even if this equation is correct, it is by no means certain that IMŠU.GAR.RIN.NA is a portable oven. For the oven occurs actually in the Bo. texts in its normal form DUGIM.ŠU.RIN.NA, KBo. II 4 II 16, III 20. The IMŠU.GAR.RIN.NA is brought in here solely because plants do not grow on it. Why should an oven be chosen for this purpose? The context suggests rather some kind of poisonous earth: and we are reminded at once of no. xvi.

But the equation itself depends on the supposition that *piran* here governs a gen. sing., a usage which is extremely rare.¹ There are grammatically two other possibilities. Either *himmaš* is gen. sing. after 'plough, wagon and chariot' and *piran* refers back to -šmaš, as in the preceding clause; or *himmaš* is dat.-loc. pl. and refers to something not mentioned in this paragraph, but presumably in an earlier part of the text where the tablet is broken. Yet even so it is impossible to obtain a sense which is reconcileable with the rest of the evidence. For the plough, wagon and chariot have nothing to do with eating and drinking, but are used purely for sympathetic magic; and on the latter alternative *himma-* must be a concrete object. However, we have found *himma-* as a concrete object in no. xv, and this explanation is therefore at least as likely as the equation with IMŠU.GAR.RIN.NA.

A II 16-19 // C I 26-28. The texts differ considerably here, A being fuller than C. The very similar passage XVII 21 I 6-13 ensures the interpretation on these lines; and the comparison shows that in this meaning also (Götze, *Madd.* 122 f., no. 2), as in that given by Götze under no. 3, *appan* and *appa kappuya(i)-* were used without distinction, whatever their difference in origin (see Sommer, *AU* 73).

18. Between *na-at* at the beginning, which seems fairly certain, and EGIR-*pa*, there is room for about three signs. In X 72 II 17 we have EGIR-*pa aš-šu-li kap-pu-ya-i*, but since the sense is there quite different, it is unlikely that *aš-šu-li* stood here. Some adverb, however, is required: perhaps SIG₅-*in*.

1. KĀ-*aš*, on which both Friedrich (*loc. cit.*) and Sommer (*BoSt.* 10 8) mainly rely, is now known to be dat.-loc. pl., KĀ being *plurale tantum* (see on C I 54), and the two passages in 2 *BoTU* cited by Sommer are both in 'old Hittite.' The only other instance known to me is DTe-*ki-pi-nu-ya-aš pi-ra-an*, XVII 10 IV 27 (Zuntz, *Orisadv.* 90).

19. An Accadian word or Sumerian ideogram is required at the beginning of this line to stand as gen. after *UNUT* and to be followed by Hittite *-ia* 'and'; otherwise there is an awkward asyndeton where the parallel text has *nu*. The restoration *A-NA Ū-NU-UT* | [KUBABBAR GUŠKIN-*ia*] is suggested by C I 26, where *A-NA KUBABBAR GUŠKIN* is substituted for (16) [*BI-IB-R*]IḪI.A-*KA* (17) [GALḪI.A-*KA*] Ū-*NU-TEMEŠ-KA* of A.¹ The space in Walther's copy hardly seems sufficient for this, but it may well have been abbreviated to KUG.UD.≡GI as in IV 2 (and II 1, where the addition of KUBABBAR is apparently due to some confusion).

For the omission of *A-NA*, which must be assumed before all the nouns in 16-17 and before É DINGIR-*LIM* in C I 26, see Friedrich, *Vert.* II 38-41.

SECTION II

A III 1-8. Similar passages are *KBo.* II 9 I 19 ff., 32 rev. 1 ff., *KUB* XV 32 I 55 ff., 34 II 8 ff., 17 ff., III 17, 39. Cf. also MU.ḪI.A ITU.ḪI.A UD.ḪI.A [*da-lu-g*]a-e-eš pa-a-i, XXI 27 III 35. The closest parallel is A IV 10+B II 11 ff.

2. On *anda aššuli nai*- see Sommer, *HAB* 46 ff. : *aššul*= 'perfection, well-being,' not 'favour, kindness.'

4. TI-an ḫark. The imperative of the 'periphrastic perfect' occurs also in B I 14 (*v. sup.*) and in *Madd.* obv. 17.

7. [*lahu*]kkiman. See below, p. 79.

7. *duškaraz*=Accad. ḫu-ud-du-ú 'rejoicing,' *KBo.* I 35 1; and this meaning is perfectly satisfactory here and in the majority of passages. What is its etymology? *KBo.* I 35 2 (*i.e.* the line following that just quoted) has [. . .]=[*r*]i?-ga=ḫu-ta-ad-du-ú=du-uš-ku-um!-mar,² which leaves no doubt that *duškaraz* is connected with the verb *dušk*-. In III 100 9 . . . -lu-uz-zu (given as=du-uš-ka₄-r[a?]-) ought to be some derivative of *elēšu*. In III 99 II 10 du-uš-ki-ia-u-ya-ar is parallel to ḫi-in-ga-ni-ia, which=Accad. *melultu* 'jubilation' in *KBo.* I 42 III 13. The root is also equivalent to *melultu* in its more special meaning of 'dance' (cf. Götze, *Kultur.* 152 with n. 5). *duškaraz* thus contains the

1. Cf. also B II 6 and C III 2.

2. See Friedrich, *ZA.* NF. V 48.

root *dušk-* + (*k*)*arat-s*, the second part of which suggests the word *kart-* 'heart.' But this is impossible in view of the forms *tu-uš-ga-ra-an-na* (2 *BoTU* 6 III 25), *du-uš-ga-ra-u-an-da* (*ibid.* 20¹) and *du-uš-ka₄-ri-ya-da* (XXII 53 6), which do not contain the *-t-*. Therefore Götze and Sturtevant¹ must be right in including it among the action nouns formed from verbs by means of the suffix *t*, *duškaranna* being the med.-pass. infin. of a verb **duškara-* (for the forms in *-yanza* see *KlF.* I 188⁸ and Sturtevant, *HGr.* §177). A remarkable variant is (nom.) *du-uš-ga-ra-aš-za* XVII 20 II 9, which is strangely similar to *ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za* in B II 9 etc. (see *ad loc.*), with its apparently superfluous *-aš-*.

8. [*zikki*] (dur.-distr. of *dai*) is not attested in these passages, but seems to be demanded by the construction *ANA ZI-ŠUNU anda*; the regular word is *peški* 'give.'

A III 10. For *nū-* and *tumantiṭa-* see Götze, *NBr.* 32.¹ There is no further evidence.

A III 12. *miṭata*. See below, p. 89, on *ḫa-at-ta-ta¹-šum-mi-it*.

A III 13. *parā neṭantan*. Ehelolf in *ZA.* NF. IX 175² comments 'Literally "eductus" (sc. out of the sheath, hence "drawn" ?).' This would be suitable for a sword; but sword is *GÎR* in the Hittite texts (as elsewhere), and *GIŠTUKUL* is probably a club, as shown by Thureau-Dangin in *RA* XXI 141 (see Sommer, *AU* 182, 233). It is true that *GIŠTUKUL* is often used for weapon in general. But Ehelolf (*loc. cit.*) quotes a text in which the term is applied to a *GIŠŠI.KAK*, which is probably a spear. Therefore Zuntz, *Ortsadv.* 70, is perhaps right in rendering metaphorically by 'angriffs-lustig.'

A III 14. *D GIŠTUKUL-in*. That *GIŠTUKUL* is an *i-* stem has already been pointed out by Götze (*AM* 232¹); the nom. in *-iṣ* occurs in XIX 8 III 26. The Hittite word is now known to be *ḫatanti-*; see Ehelolf, *ap. Sommer*, *HAB* 132 f.

Why the scribe has deified the weapon is a mystery, especially since he has not done so in the parallel passage XV 34 II 22.

A III 15. *na-at in[-. na-at* must refer to the enemies' countries, either as subject or object of the verb to be restored. The verbs

1. Götze, *Madd.* 78 ff.; Sturtevant, *HGr.* §155.

innaraṣeš- 'become strong (?)' and *innaraḥ-* 'make strong (?)'¹ therefore have the wrong sense; and since *innaraṣanza* and *innaraṣātār* are impossible in the context, there only remains the adverb *innarā* followed by a verb such as *ḥarkandu* 'let (them) perish' or *ḥarkanūt* 'destroy (them),' for each of which there is an analogy in Bo. 2073 (v. inf.). *laknut*, which occurs with *innarā* in XXVI 1 III 43, would be too weak here.

The adverb *innarā* is found in the following contexts:

XIII 7 I 17 f. *nu-za a-pa-a-aš kat-ta-ya-tar ša-an-aḥ-zi* (18) *nu a-pu-u-un UKÛ-an A-NA LUGAL in-na-ra-a ku-na-an-na pa-a-i* 'and he is seeking vengeance² and delivers that man *innarā* to the king to be killed.'

XXVI 1 III 41 ff. *na-aš-ma tu-uk ku-iš-ki ḪUL-lu-uš* (42) *PA-NI DUTU-ŠI-ma-aš SI×DI[-a]n-za zi-ik-ma-an-kán* (43) *in-na-ra-a la-ak-nu-ši nu-uš-ši-kán ḥu-ua-ap-ti ku-ít-ki* 'or (if) someone is obnoxious to you, but is "established" (i.e. in favour) before the king, and you contrive his downfall *innarā* and malign (?) him somehow.'

XXVI 32 I 14 ff. *ma-a-an-ma-aš-ši LÚ.MEŠ URUḪat-ti in-na-ra-a-ma ú-ya-a-i* (15) *ú-te-ir* 'but if the men of Ḫatti were troublesome to him (?) *innarā*.'

Bo. 2073 I 36³ *pu-nu-uš-du in-na-ra-a-ya-mu-kán ku-i-e-eš ḥar-ga-mu-ir* 'let him ask "Who have ruined me *innarā*?"'

Bo. 2073 II 48, *nu-ya am-mu-uk GIM-an in-na-ra-a ḥar-ak-mi* (49) *zi-ik-ma-ya DINGIR-LUM EN-IA am-me-el ḥa-an-ni-i[š-šar]* (50) *pu-nu-uš-ki* 'And when I am ruined *innarā*, do thou, O God my lord, examine my case.'

XXI 33 20 and XXIII 78 9 are valueless.

In the first three of these passages, and quite possibly also in the last two, *innarā* is associated with an element of deliberate ill-will. This is particularly clear in XXVI 1. For there it is expressly stated that the object of *laknuši* is a personal enemy; whereas in the preceding clause, where the same action is taken at the instigation of a third

1. The base *innar-* denotes some kind of excellence, although the precise meaning 'strong' is not established; see Sommer, *AU* 21.

2. See on C II 31, p. 98.

3. Quoted by Forrer in *KlF*. I 301. Prof. Ehelolf has shown me the photograph of this tablet, and it appears that Forrer's reference to line 5 is false.

party—and so the element of personal animosity is lacking—the word *innarā* is omitted. Further, the expressions *huyap-* and *uyai uda-*, which are associated with *innarā* in XXVI 1 III 43 and XXVI 32 I 14 f. respectively, are known from *Hatt.* I 34 to denote personal hostility. Hence *innarā* would seem to express the manner in which one acts against a personal enemy; and the present passage, where this way of acting is ascribed to the Gods, shows that it cannot imply some ignoble motive, such as 'spitefully,' or 'jealously.' The translation 'angrily' ('in or from anger') does not, it is true, fit perfectly in Bo. 2073 II 48, but seems more satisfactory than any other in view of all the available evidence.

A III 17. *karšan* (?). *ma-a-ša-an* is the reading adopted by Sturtevant in *HGl.*, where Götze suggests the meaning 'revolt.' The text, however, contains two small horizontal wedges before the sign read *ma*, as shown in Walther's copy and confirmed by collation with the photograph; the apparent '*ma*' also is somewhat short. Thus the reading *ma-* is uncertain and depends on the assumption that the two small wedges were intended to be erased; and it is no less possible to suppose that the scribe intended to write one wedge instead of two, and to read the group *ma-a* as *kar*.¹ Now this list of afflictions occurs again in B II 11 = A IV 8, but there this word is represented by the ideogram NAM.𒀭.A, which probably means 'locusts' (*v. inf.*). Here therefore we ought to have the Hittite word for 'locust,' and this further supports the reading *kar-ša-an* (connected with *karš-* 'cut'), for we should then have a striking parallel with the Hebrew קִרְשָׁן. But what, then, is the relation to *kar-ša-an-na-kán an-da iš-hu-i* (*KBo.* II 3 II 32) and *kar-aš-šu-uš . . . iš-hu-uh-hu-un* (*KUB XVII 10 III 6-7*)? See Sommer, *AU* 226², and below on C II 12.

C I 33 f. A further instance of the rendering of a comparison by means of the simple adj. with the dative, for which see Friedrich in *AOF* III 185 f. and *ZA. NF.* V 43¹, Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 189.

C I 34 f. *ḫandantaš ḫannešnaš EN-aš*. This is the first of the masc. epithets which show that this hymn was originally written for some deity other than the Sun-goddess of Arinna; see introduction. We are here concerned with the meaning of the phrase. In the first

1. Cf. *la-a* for *kar*, *KBo.* VI 2 I 8 (Hrozný, *CH* 6²), *KUB XVII 24 III 23b*.

place the interpretation of *ḥannešnaš* EN-aš as 'lord of judgment' in the sense 'patron of justice' or 'supreme judge' seems fairly certain in view of the general character of the Sun-god, who in his daily course surveys all that goes on in all parts of the earth: see Götze, *Kultur*. 129. It is true that *BÊL DÎNI* has the meaning 'legal opponent,' but *ŠAMAŠ BÊL DÎNI* in the sense 'lord of judgment' is common in Accadian, and it seems unlikely that Ehelolf was right¹ in translating 'legal opponent' here. But the exact meaning of *ḥandantaš* is not so clear. This word is elsewhere only the participle of *ḥanda(i)*- 'fix, establish' (though a somewhat similar adjectival use of it is apparently attested in XVII 10 II 31). It is never equivalent to *parā ḥandanza*, as pointed out by Sommer, *HAB* 98, against Ehelolf in his translation. What then is a 'fixed' *ḥanneššar*? Possibly the regular, established court of law. But it is more natural to take the word as equivalent to *ḥantaš*, which Götze² has shown to mean 'true, just' (=Accad. *kēnu*), the form in *-anza* being merely an extension of the simple adj. (see Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 171). Sommer supports this interpretation by a reference to XIII 2 III 28 *kuīt ḥandan*, which clearly means 'what is just' (i.e. fixed, laid down by the law?); but this may equally well come from *ḥandaš*. There is thus no certain analogy for *ḥandanza*=just, but there is also no serious objection to this translation.

C I 36. *dudduškiši*. Sommer, *HAB* 180, has now discussed this word in his commentary on 2 *BoTU* 8 III 59—the only other passage which can be used as evidence for it. He has there shown³ that it is a question of offending noblemen who are to be tried before(?) the assembly; not, as is implied by Götze's translation in *Kultur*. 80, of the members of the assembly, whom the young king is to 'conciliate.' Friedrich, in *ZA*. NF. IX 292² had suggested 'supervise, watch over,' and this, although expressly rejected by Sommer, does not seem to differ materially from his own tentative translation 'rule mercifully over.' Something of the kind is clearly required. The difficulty is that in the present passage the 'kingship of heaven and earth' is most naturally interpreted (with Götze, who without regard to 2 *BoTU* 8 translates 'übst du aus') as the dominion of the Sun-god himself (cf. XXI 19 I 2: DUTU URU *Arinna* SAL.LUGAL *ŠAMÊ Û IRŠITIM*),

1. *Berl. Mus. Ber.*, 1928, 33.
3. So also in *OLZ* 38, 279.

2. *Hatt.* 91 f.

whereas, if *druddušḱ-* means anything approaching 'rule over,' it is necessary to take 'kingship of heaven and earth' as a collective expression for 'all kings.' This is also the view of Ehelolf, who translates 'bestowest' (betreust); and we may perhaps compare *KBo.* I 1 rev. 35, 40: DUTU URU^{Arinna} LUGAL-utta ù SAL.LUGAL-utta uma'ar, and for Šamaš as ordainer of kingship Ebeling, *Quellen* I (*MVAG* 1918) 25.14, 26.12. Nevertheless it is difficult to explain the addition of *nepišaš* except as an example of poetic licence similar to that indulged in by Puduḫepa in the letter *KUB XXI* 38 (Sommer, *AU* 260).

As regards the etymology of the word the reader must be referred to Sommer, *HAB* 180-2. It is impossible to follow Sturtevant, who cites the word (*HGr.* § 289) as an example of reduplication, since *dušḱ-* has an entirely different meaning (see p. 71). In fact Sommer finds the simple verb *duddu-* in *XXVI* 16 II (?) 8. But the connexion with *duddu* (*ḫalzai-*) and *duddunu-*, which according to Sommer are respectively an exclamation='hush!' or 'pardon!' and a verb='pardon' remains, in spite of Sommer's remarks, problematical.

C I 39, 40. *ginzuyalaš, ginzu. ginzuyala-* = *RÊMĒNU* 'merciful' (refs. *ap.* Sturtevant, *HGl.*). The meaning 'mercy' for *ginzu* is secondary; the primary sense is seen in (*UZU*)*ginzu* (*VII* 1 III 5, 17, 24, VIII 36 obv. 16) for which Sommer (*HAB* 81) has plausibly suggested the meaning 'lap, genitals.' On the suffix *-(u ?)ala-* see Sommer, *AU* 50, 387.

C I 40. *pa-ra-a ḫa-an-da-an-za-ša-kán.* The sign *ša* is inserted as the only means of writing *ḫandanz-a-kán*: see Friedrich, *Vert.* 1 32 ff., Sturtevant, *HGr.* §§ 35, 69.

The subst. *parā ḫand(and)ātar* (the long and short forms are identical in meaning) is everywhere an attribute of deities, and denotes the super-human power in virtue of which they are able to perform wondrous deeds.¹ It is defined by Götze (*Kulturg.* 138) as a power hypostatized which rests upon the bearer and may by him be transferred to or infect any who come into contact with him. Thus the participial form *parā ḫandanza* is applied to a man who has come under this divine influence, and king Ḫattusili states² that as a result of this he did not commit the wickedness of mankind. The same participle, however, is also used

1. The power may be exercised for good or for evil. See Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10 30 f.; Götze, *Ḫatt.* 52-5; Ehelolf, *Berl. Mus. Ber.* 49.34a fn. 2.

2. *Ḫatt.* i 46 ff.

twice (in line 47, below, and in VI 45 III 58) of a god, and this creates a difficulty; for if *parā ḥandanza* is a true participle from a verb **parā ḥandā-*, meaning (like *parā ḥandandā-*, *Hatt. I 21*) 'control by divine power,' then it must be active when applied to a god and passive only when applied to a man, as alleged by Zuntz, *Ortsadv.* 78. The difficulty is met by supposing with Götze (*v. sup.*) that the god, like the man, was regarded as being endowed (pass. !) with a power which was essentially independent of him.¹ We then have also a satisfactory account of the grammatical development: **parā ḥandā-* 'to fill with power (*mana*),' *parā ḥandanza* 'filled with power,' *parā ḥandātar* 'condition of being filled with power,' *parā ḥandandā-* 'make *parā ḥandanza*,' *parā ḥandandātar* 'condition of being made *parā ḥandanza*.' The last two forms would arise when *parā ḥandanza* had ceased to be felt as a participle and had become a simple adjective.

Now Sturtevant has more recently² propounded a slightly different view. According to him *parā* 'suggests an emanation from the godhead,' and the phrase *parā ḥandandā-* may be translated 'control by divine emanation'; 'that the participle is sometimes used of a god is not strange; any human quality may be ascribed to a god.' This is an attempt to find an analytical explanation of the phrase, the lack of which is a conspicuous defect in the former view. But it is difficult to believe that a word meaning literally 'controlled by divine emanation' could be applied to a god; although in general it is worth considering whether the epithet may really belong primarily to man and only secondarily to god. This is actually an advantage in the present text, for if *parā ḥandanza* already implies divine influence, then to say 'the *p. ḥ.* man is dear to thee (a god)' is practically tautologous, the predicate being included in the subject. We are here in the region of speculation, but it seems possible that men of exceptional ability or excellence were regarded as superhuman, and that *parā ḥandanza*, lit. 'established out,' meant originally 'lifted out of the common herd and dwelling on a higher plane.' Such men would be rare; the gods, on the other hand, would all possess this quality, and this might account for the fact that *parā ḥand(and)ātar* is only attested in connexion with gods. The question cannot be finally settled until the expression is found in a different and more literal sense.

1. This is also the view of Ehelolf (*Berl. Mus. Ber.* 49.34a²).

2. *Chrest.* 85 f. and 229.

C I 41. *an-ta-uh-ya-ah-ha-aš*. This spelling is unique, even for this remarkable word. The scribe apparently started to write *antuhšaš*, but changed over to *antuyahhaš* in the middle, forgetting, however, to delete the *-uh-*.

C I 42. [*ša*] *rleškiši*. This restoration is suggested by Götze in *KlF*. I 226. The verb is used in a legal sense in the second plague-prayer, § 4, 8 (*KlF*. I 210), for 'raise up, cause to prevail, exalt,' which gives excellent sense here. The restoration proposed by Friedrich in *ZA*. NF. IX 292²—[*i-l*]*a-li-eš-ki-ši*—is clearly too long for the available space. [*d*]*a-* and [*t*]*a-* are precluded by the absence of the Winkelhaken, the top of which would be bound to protrude above the break to the left of the final vertical stroke. The only other possibility is [*m*]*a-li-eš-ki-ši*, which is adopted by Götze in his translation ('thou grantest forgiveness') and in Sturtevant, *HGl*. s.v. *maleske/a-*. The meaning 'approve, consent' was established by Sommer, *AU* 161 f., for the simple verb *malā-*. But the dur.-dist. stem occurs outside this passage only in V 6 III 8 (Sommer, *AU* 162 and 285), and Sommer is doubtful whether it belongs to the same root—a doubt which is certainly intensified by the fact that in both passages it is used without the particle *-za*, for the verb *malā-*, when active, invariably has the particle¹ (except perhaps in XVI 42 obv. 36, where, however, the first word of the sentence is probably lost). This is in itself not a serious objection, but *šarlesk-* gives unquestionably better sense.

C I 43. *ḫulaleššar* is formed from the verb *ḫulaliḫa-*, which means 'encircle, wrap,' the object being either the cord or wrapper (e.g. *KBo*. V 1 IV 8, *KUB* XXVII 38 I 22) or the thing wrapped (e.g. *KBo*. III 27 I 27 [subj. 'snake'], *KUB* VIII 12 obv. 6, X 63 I 31, XVII 28 I 31, XII 34 I 5, XXIII 11 II 23). The verb is not used for tying two things together, but for enclosing in a complete circuit—hence *ḫulali* = 'winding sheet.' Consequently the noun must mean 'circuit' rather than 'bond' or 'ligament,' which supports Götze's translation 'Runde' against Ehelolf's 'Band (?)' and excludes the connexion with *markas šamē u iršitim*.

Accadian has nevertheless two expressions which denote the same or

1. See Friedrich, *OLZ* 39 308. When the verb is pass. *-za* is absent: V 1 II 14, XXI 38 I 26, XXII 37 obv. 7, 12. In V 1 I 8, 11, III 23, 28 *-za* is the abl. ending (Sommer, *AU* 162³).

a similar cosmological idea, namely *puluk šamē u iršitim* and *kippat šamē u iršitim*. But the parallel with the latter is actually much closer than with the former. For Götze in *The Hittite Ritual of Tunlawi*, p. 83, has now demonstrated that the original meaning of *pulukku* (also *pulluku* and *palluku*) is not boundary, as supposed by Meissner,¹ but cone (of the pine); from this it was transferred to the cone-shaped boundary-stone and to the cone of a mountain. Thus in the phrase *puluk šamē u iršitim* the universe is most probably visualised as a mountain.² On the other hand there is good reason to believe that *kippatu* from *kapāpu* 'bend' means circle, or ring,³ which gives a very close parallel with *hulaleššar*.

C I 44. *lalukkimaš* is an action noun⁴ from a verb **laluk-*, from which we have the -eš- form *lalukkeš-*. It is a pleasant condition or activity within the body⁵—*ZI-aš*, XV 32 I 57, *ZI-ŠU-NU anda*, A III 6-7 (v. inf.), *tueggaš anda*, XV 34 II 28; probably also XVI 37 II 9 had a similar context (cf. passages like V 4 I 12-14, XVI 29 obv. 28, VI 3 2 f., 15 ff.). Some connexion with light is suggested by the formation of the word, apparently a reduplicated form from the root *luk-*, and by the fact that it occurs in VIII 16 9, a text concerned with stars; hence presumably Götze's translation 'Leuchte.' But no reliance can be placed on VIII 16, since that text is so fragmentary that it is not even clear whether *[la-lu-uk-ki-eš-zi]* in line 9 belongs to the omen or to its interpretation. In XV 34 II 27 it is a property of red wool, which has been soaked in fine oil, though probably the wool alone is intended here, since the analogy with the oil follows in 29. But how can a pleasant condition within the body be characteristic of red wool? The apparent reduplication may be entirely deceptive. A colourless translation such as 'repose' will fit most passages (cf. Accad. *nuḫ libbi*)⁶; but to translate 'place of repose, fulcrum, centre' (Ehelolf: 'Ruhepunkt') is to attribute a modern scientific knowledge of the solar system to a geocentric age. The physical sun was the source of light, life and heat; and something of this kind must be intended in the present passage.

1. *Beiträge zum Assyrischen Wörterbuch*, II, no. 53.

2. See Jeremias, *Handbuch*, p. 130.

3. Thureau-Dangin, *Huitième Campagne de Sargon* 59^a; Ebeling, *Quellen*, II 77 note on line 17. See also Muss-Arnolt and Weir, *Lexicon*, s.v.

4. Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 167.

5. It thus disposes of Götze's statement that all -*maš* formations are unpleasant (*KlF.* I 187).

6. So also Zuntz, *TIS* 64.

C I 45. *aššanuranza*. Here used in the sense noted by Götze, *Madd.* 104, as no. 2. A further instance of the use of the simple adj. where we should render by a superlative (cf. Friedrich, *AOF* III 185 f.), as noticed by Forrer in his translation.

C I 46. *attaš annaš*. A phrase (Sum.) *ama-a-a* 'mother-father' = (Accad.) *abi ummi* 'father-mother' is used in certain texts for the 'previous stage of development, prototype, former generation' of gods: see Deimel, *Pantheon Babylonicum* 18-23, and Zimmern in *ZA* XXIII 364. Forrer¹ claims to have found the phrase *attaš annaš* used in the same way in Hittite.² Obviously, however, this is inapplicable to the present passage, as Forrer himself points out,³ and we must understand the expression as an asyndeton = 'the father (and) the mother.'⁴ There is a close parallel in the hymn to Šamaš translated by Langdon in *OECT* VI 52, lines 17-18, and for Marduk in Hehn, *BA* V 350 34; also Ehelolf (*Berl. Mus. Ber.* 34a⁴) draws attention to Scharff, *Aegyptische Sonnenlieder*, p. 67: 'Thou, O Aton, art mother and father of them whose eyes thou hast formed.'

The order of the words is noteworthy. In Accadian the order was regularly *abi ummi* (cf. passages cited above and Weir, *Lex. of Accad. Prayers*, p. 4). In Sumerian *ama-a-a* is usual, though in the text in *OECT* VI the Nippur variant has *a-a ama* (under the influence of the Accadian ?). In Hittite the order 'father-mother' is frequent (Hrozný, *CH* 22 7-9, 24 12; *KUB* VIII 35 I 4,⁵ XIV 7 IV 12, XVII 9 I 28, 29 II 7; *VBoT* 58 I 17; *Bo.* 2388⁶; and here); against this, the inverse order occurs in the Anitta text (*KBo.* III 22 I 9) and in *KBo.* V I I 41 (cf. Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10.32²).

C I 47. For this use of *parā handanza* cf. VI 45 III 58 (46 IV 27), and see above pp. 76-7.

1. *Mel. Cum.* 691 with n. 2.

2. But cf. DINGIR.MEŠ *ABI* (*KBo.* IV 13 VI 13, *KUB* II 13 VI 22, X 92 V 9, XXVII 13 I 20), Hittite *attaš* DINGIR.MEŠ (Sommer, *BoSt.* 10.47). The meaning 'gods of the father' is proved by II 13 VI 22 f.: LUGAL-uš DÜR-aš DINGIR.MEŠ *A-BI-ŠU*! GAL-az I-ŠU e-ku-zi 'the king seated gives the Gods of his father to drink once from a GAL-vessel.' Cf. also ŠA *A-BI-ŠU* DINGIR.MEŠ. 520/f 6, 9 (*ap.* Ehelolf, *MDOG* 75 65) and DINGIR.MEŠ *A-BI-aš* (presumably = *šunnaš attas*), X 92 V 10.

3. Forrer's false reference is presumably due to a hasty glance at *Real. Ass.* I 150.

4. For asyndesis in short phrases see Sommer, *AU* 157.

5. Horoscope: cf. Götze, *Kultur.* 162.

6. Hurrian epic: cf. Forrer, *loc. cit.*; Güterbock, *ZA*. NF. X 90 ff.

C I 48. *tarrijašhaš*. Götze *ap.* Sturtevant, *HGl. s.v. tarrijašhas* and *darija/e-*, has had the happy idea of combining this word with *tarijan*, *tarijandan*, below col. II 35-6. That *tarijan-* means 'tired' or something very close to it, is in fact the only possible deduction from the latter passage, and since *tarrijašhaš* is given as = (Accad.) *mānahtu* 'toil' there can be little doubt that Götze is right. On *tarijan-* and the verb *tarija-* see on C II 34-7.

C I 49. *karūileš* DINGIR.MEŠ. Forrer in *Mél. Cum.* 697 ff. has now shown that this term, which varies in the treaties with the Accadian *ilāni ša dārātim* or *ilāni dārūti*¹ (perhaps also with *ilāni iršitim*, *v. inf.*), denotes the group of gods which in those texts invariably follows it, consisting of six otherwise unknown deities, Alalu (=Alala, Deimel *Panth.* 65 ?), four well-known Sumerian deities (Anu, Antu, Enlil, Ninlil) and three whose presence in the group is optional (Kumarpi, Apantum and Bélit-ekalli): see Forrer's convenient arrangement of the lists, *loc. cit.* 699. Forrer further maintains that these are the gods of the past, *i.e.* of the previous generations who have been deposed by those of the present, as described in the epic of Kumarpis, and that they live in the underworld, whither they have been driven by their conquerors.²

Forrer's arguments appear in the main to be sound. There can be little doubt that these gods dwelt in the underworld: cf. Bo. 2072, where they are described as 'lords of earth,' and are connected with the *uappu* in the passage cited by Forrer in *RHA.* I 146; Bo. 2535 (connexion with *uappu*)³; and the passages (quoted by Tenner, *ZA.* NF. IV 187-9) *KBo.* II 9 I 17, *KUB* XII 50 3, XV 35 IV 39 (association with the Sun-god of Earth and the Anunnakki); similarly *KBo.* I 1 rev. 51 is evidence for an association, if not an identity, with the *ilāni iršitim* 'gods of the underworld.'⁴ Further, there is certainly some

1. Friedrich, *Vert.* I 47 f., Götze, *KLF.* I 178.

2. Götze in his *Kulturg.* distinguishes the six gods Nāra, Napsara, Minku (Munki), Ammunki, Tuḫusi (Tusi) and Ammizadu from the rest, and suggests tentatively that they may be of Hurrian or Amoritish origin (p. 125 f.); *karūileš* he interprets as practically = 'immortal' (p. 137). Ehelolf (*Berl. Mus. Ber.*, 1928, 34b) wrote: 'The Hittite pantheon knows "lasting, eternal gods," "old gods" (who, however, continue to exist) and "new gods".'

3. See *JRAS*, 1937, 113 ff.

4. It seems probable that *ilāni iršiti* stands for Ereškigal, who appears in the same position in the variant, and not (as maintained by F.) for the following group, who will then be without a title, as in *Al.*; for Ereškigal (=Allatum) and sometimes the Sun-god of Earth—*i.e.* the underworld deities proper—appear regularly in the lists, though usually in an earlier position.

In the newly published text XXIX I II 2-3 we actually find the phrase *kat-te-ir-ri-eš ka-ru-ú-e-li-e-eš* DINGIR.MEŠ 'infernal (and) ancient gods,' referring to Istustais and Papias, of whom nothing is known (cf. IX I II 4-5).

connexion with the Kumarpi legend. The clearest evidence for this is Bo. 2379 (quoted by Forrer on p. 705), where we find the phrase 'Anu's manhood' together with the god Nara and with room between for the rest of the Ancient Gods; it is in accordance with this that the Ancient Gods are addressed in Hurrian in *VBoT* 16 rev. 7. Note, however, that the epic itself concerns only the three gods Anu, Alalu, and Kumarpi (though Minki and Ammunki are apparently mentioned in the invocation at the beginning), whereas these three are not mentioned at all among the 'lords of earth' in Bo. 2072. The relation of these gods to each other can only be clarified by a more complete edition of the Kumarpi epic. VII 41 rev. 14 ff. and XII 51 18 are useless as evidence.

The only serious difficulty in Forrer's position lies in the name. It is true that *karu(i)li-* commonly means 'of the past, former': e.g. *KBo.* II 3 IV 10 and *KlF.* I 208.5 (former kings), and *KUB* XIV 13 I 21 (formerly). But what of *ilāni dārūti* or *ša dārūtīm*? Friedrich (*Vert.* I 47 f.) and Götze (*KlF.* I 178) have pointed out that the Hittite and Accadian terms do not exactly correspond, the former expressing duration in the past or from the past to the present, and the latter indicating duration in general, including the future. In other words, the Hittite emphasises the beginning of the duration as being in the distant past, the Accadian the fact that it is unending. Thus *dārūti* is hardly the natural way to describe gods who have been deposed: we should have expected *ilāni ša pānānunma*, *ša ūme ruqūti*, or the like. The two can in fact only be combined by supposing that (in Ehelolf's words) these are 'old gods, who however continue to exist.' Then their relation to the Kumarpi legend will not be quite that supposed by Forrer.

In any case it is clear that we have here a group of underworld deities who belong in the sphere of Hurrian mythology. Thus the hymn here passes from the Sun-god's character as the heavenly luminary to his activities in the underworld.

C I 50-52. Šamaš allots the portions (*isiqšunu*) to the Igigi in *KAR* 32.32 (edited by Ebeling, *MVAG* 1918, 1, 34 ff.). Cf. also Epic of Creation VI 140, where Marduk assigns the gods their portions in Ušukkinaku. Langdon there interprets 'portions' in the sense of spheres of influence in the pantheon. But the reference to sacrifices suggests that *ḪA.LA* means simply 'rations' here, as e.g. in *XIII* 2

IV 29. Šamaš also assigns (?) food-offerings (*nindabē*) to the Igigi in Gray, *Šamaš*, I I 14. See below, p. 84.

C I 55. The restoration [DURU URU*A*-ri-in-na] is based on the fragment 78/c, which here has]DUTU-uš *šar-ra-aš-ki-i[t*. 78/c is a duplicate to 804/b, etc., which contains an almost identical hymn addressed to 'DUTU-e.' These and other similar texts are being collected by Herr H. Otten (to whose kindness I owe my knowledge of them) for publication. The hymn will then be practically complete.

KÁ-uš *šarriškitta*. This is the only instance of *šarra-* with the obj. KÁ 'gate.' Elsewhere the verb is commonly used in a similar context with *GISkattaluzzi*. In both cases the verb must obviously have the same meaning, and the present passage proves that the *sense* is 'to pass through' (the gate), not, as suggested by Sturtevant in *JAOS* LIV 400, 'to open' (double doors), for here the opening of the doors is described in the previous line. Actually, however, the use of *šarra-* in this expression is derived directly from its meaning 'violate (a pledge)'; for *GISkattaluzzi šarra-* always represents a privilege, and it is clear from the magical use of gates in the Tunnawi text that a gate was felt to act as a barrier to unprivileged persons.¹ The implication of privilege is undoubtedly present here also in the 'passing of the gate of heaven.'

The present passage confirms the meaning 'threshold' for *kattaluzzi*, which is shown by the variant KÁ to be part of the gate, as opposed to the door.²

KÁ 'gate' is *plurale tantum* in Hittite: nom. KÁ.ḪI.A-eš (XII 44 III 2), KÁ.ḪI.A (XII 40 II 3, 5); dat./loc. KÁ-aš *anda* (XXVII 29 I 26, *VBoT* 24 I 26), KÁ-aš *parā arnuzi* (see Zuntz, *Ortsadv.* 61), KÁ-aš *parā neḫari* (Zuntz, *ibid.* 69). Cf. Güterbock, *ZA*. NF. VIII 227¹; and for KÁ.GAL, which is also plural, Ehelolf in *KlF*. I 395⁵.

C I 58. *a-ru-ú-i-iš-kán-zi* is restored according to the traces from 78/c (see previous note), which has *a-ru-e-eš-kán-zi*. The final *zi* appears to have been omitted for lack of space.

1. See Götze, *Tunnawi*, p. 47.

2. *GISkattaluzzi* could not in any case be the door itself (Friedrich, *ZA*. NF. V 48 f., and Sturtevant, *loc. cit.*), because *GISGÁL*, which would then be its ideogram, inflects as an *a-* stem (acc. *GISGÁL-an-na*, *HT* I II 10). In XI 17 IV 9-11 the king steps up (on ?) to the *kattaluzzi*: *ta-aš-ša-an GISkat-ta-lu-uz-zi ti-i-e[-iz-z]i* (note *-šan*). And in *KBo*. IV 2 I 30, 35, 43, there is an upper and a lower *k*, with which Sommer (*HAB* 88 f.) well compares the Roman *limen inferum et superum* 'threshold and lintel.'

C I 50-58. The influence of Accadian ideas on this hymn has been pointed out in the introduction, p. 10. The opening of the gate of heaven is especially common in the Accadian hymns, though it is always performed by the Sun-god himself, not by his attendant deities, as here. In the beautiful hymn Gray, *Šamaš* 1 (=Schollmeyer, *Šamaš* 16), however, there is in col. I 13-15 a striking parallel to lines 50-8 of the present text:

šu-pal-ki ba-a-bi ša ka-liš [
ša kul-lat ¹*Igigi nindabē-šu-nu* [
¹*Šamaš ana a-ši-ka kit-mu-sa* [¹*A-nun-na-ki* (?)].

Here we find again the three elements—opening of the gate (by whom is not clear), food-offerings, and kneeling—in immediate juxtaposition. Hence it seems probable that in line 14 we should restore not *ta-mah-har* ‘thou receivest,’ as suggested by Schollmeyer, but some word such as *ta-ya-ta-da* ‘thou allottest’ (*KAR* 32.32) or *ta-šar-rak* ‘thou givest’ (cf. *RA* 13.108.18). It is unfortunate that neither the subject of *kitmusa* in line 15 nor that of *aruyēškanzi* in C I 58 is preserved.

SECTION III

C II 1-2. Enough remains of these two lines (*ku-e*[. . . followed by *na-at iš*[. . .]) to show that they have the general sense ‘hear the words which I utter,’ with which prayers are commonly introduced in Hittite, e.g. B I 14, and the plague-prayers *KIF*. I 164.7 and 242.19-20. But *pa-ra-a i*[. . .]¹ in line 2 suggests that the relative clause had the construction found in XXVII 29 II 17 ff.: *ud-da-ar-ma-aš-š[i]* *ku-e* KA×U-az *pa-ra-a i-ia-at-ta-ri* ‘the words which proceed from his mouth.’

The appearance in line 1 of the Sun-goddess of Arinna (this seems to be the only possible reading) would be strange unless the gods also are here mentioned, since the prayer that follows is addressed almost entirely to them. Hence we may suppose the remaining lacuna in line 1 to have been filled by either *šu-ma-a-aš* or *A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ*.

C II 4. Cf. *KIF*. I 246 49. *namma* is here apparently used in the inferential sense for *nu namma*.

1. *d[a-* and *i[t-* are also possible, but with these readings the sentence cannot be so easily reconstructed.

C II 4-13. The asyndesis in lines 6, 9 and 11 shows that those three sentences are all intended to explain¹ the preceding sentence (lines 4-6); lines 4-6 thus contain the general statement covering the details of the following lines.

This bears out the interpretation of NINDA $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i- DUGi $\bar{s}$ pantuzzi- given above (p. 55) following Sommer, *HAB* 171 f., as an expression denoting the gods' daily rations of food and drink in the most general sense. For in the details that follow there is a logical explanation of the absence of the NINDA $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-, but there is nothing to correspond to DUGi $\bar{s}$ pantuzzi (the drinking vessel): instead we find an apology for the cessation of the animal sacrifices (11-13), which must nevertheless be included in the phrase NINDA $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i- DUGi $\bar{s}$ pantuzzi as forming part of the gods' rations.

C II 6. L $\bar{U}$ M[$\bar{E}$ $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{A}$ PIN.LA]L. This restoration fills the space and is required by the context and by the parallelism with III 6 f. Walther's copy gives two small wedges to the left of the vertical, however, and these do not suit 'MEŠ'; but from my own collation these wedges do not appear to be significant.

C II 7, 8. *anneškir, ani $\bar{a}$ nzi*. In the agricultural sphere this verb takes the objects 'fields' (*KBo*. VI 3 II 41 and here), 'seed' (*Hatt*. II 16, *KUB* VIII 78 IV 17, V 12, 16, VI 2, 6, 9; XIII 2 III 40, 4 IV 13) and 'corn' (*halkin*, XIII 4 IV 12). The preponderance of 'seed' is striking, and since the verb is opposed to *yarš-* 'reap' in line 8,² it seems that, in spite of its otherwise very general meaning,³ it has developed the specific sense of 'sow.'

C II 11. UD $\bar{U}$ auli $\bar{u}$ š. UDU is here evidently determinative since -*kán* must come after the first word: in the similar passage XVII 21 II 18 it is omitted. On the stem and meaning of the word see above, p. 59 f.

C II 12. *kar-aš-k[i-ir]* is the only possible restoration in view of the traces and of the fact that by analogy with the previous sentences we

1. Cf. Sommer, *AU* 54, 129, etc., Ungnad in *ZA*. NF. III 283².

2. Götze, *NBr*. 61¹. We now have further proof of this meaning in XXIX 7 rev. 20-1: L $\bar{U}$ ŠE.KIN.KUD-aš *ma-a-a $\bar{h}$ -ha-an mi-ja-a-an i-ja-at-nu-ya-an ha-a-šu-ya-a-iSAR* [.]. *ya-ar-aš-ta* 'as the harvester reaps the ripe',

3. Götze, *AM* 224 f.

must have here a verb in the 3 pl. pret. denoting the normal activities previous to the plague. Moreover, the use of the verb is exactly parallel to that in XIII 4 IV 56 ff. : note especially the ablatives *ḥa-li-ia-az a-ša-u-na-az* in both passages. It is thus an undeniable fact that the same verb *karš-* occurs here in the sense noted by Sommer, *AU* 226-9, as no. 2, and three lines lower in what is unquestionably a different sense, namely, Sommer's no. 6 : see on line 15.

The distinguishing feature of the passages grouped by Sommer under no. 2 is the performance of the operation *karš-* upon living creatures. Sommer points out that the procedure is carried out upon oxen (IV 3 obv. 12 ff.) as well as sheep (therefore not 'shear'), perhaps also on men as a punishment (2 *BoTU* 23A II 29), and even on women (XII 43 11). All live after the process. In XVII 10 III 5 the object is UDU.NITA. *ḤI.A* 'rams.' Sommer further draws attention to the reference to fat animals in XIII 4 IV 63 (a point also noticed by Sturtevant in his edition of the text in *JAOS* LIV 306 and 406). Hence the suggestion that in all these passages *karš-* 'cut' has the special meaning 'castrate' seems very plausible. Probably XVI 53 obv. 9 (UDU.*ḤI.A* *kar-š[a²-an²-te²-eš²]*) should be added to the list.

However, this interpretation is not entirely satisfactory either in the present text or in XIII 4 IV 56 ff. In the latter passage the words *ma-a-an kar-ša-at-tar ku-ya-pi kar-aš-te-ni* introduce a paragraph describing offences which might be committed by those in charge of cattle on their way from the sheepfold or the stable to the temple, where their flesh is to be offered as food to the gods. For instance, they might sell or eat these cattle (which are naturally of the first quality) and substitute inferior ones. It would perhaps be unsafe to assert that among the Hittites castrated animals would not be used for this purpose, in spite of the Hebrew and Babylonian rule that sacrificial animals should be 'without blemish.' But the castration of the animals, assuming that this is implied by their fatness, would have taken place some time before and would be quite irrelevant here; for the opening line should describe either the essence (purpose) of the enterprise or its beginning (the departure from the fold). In fact the ablatives *ḥa-li-ia-az a-ša-u-na-az*, which, as already mentioned, are used with the same verb not only in XIII 4 IV 59 but also in the present passage, seem to show that *karš-* must have a sense involving departure from the stable or the fold. It is admittedly possible to understand Sturtevant's translation of

line 59 'as it (has been) castrated (?) from the stable or the fold' as = 'as it (has been) castrated (and brought) from (etc.),' but only because the idea of bringing can be supplied from line 57. In the present text the phrase stands alone, and the ablatives must be directly governed by the verb *karš-*. This, then, must also be the case in XIII 4 IV 59, as is indeed clear from the order of the words in the Hittite. But castration does not involve departure from the *hāli* (except perhaps for the actual operation). If proof is needed, we have it in col. II 16 and 19 of the same text, where the servants are forbidden to steal a fat ox or a fat sheep and put it into their own *hāli* or *ašayar* (if fat animals are not necessarily castrated the argument loses its main support).

Literally then in these two texts *karš-* = 'cut (from the stable or the fold).' It is undoubtedly a technical term (note the expression *karšattar karš-*), and would therefore seem to mean 'separate, select (for some special purpose).'¹ The purpose in both these texts is to provide a feast for the gods. Furthermore, in XVII 10 III 5 the 12 rams seem to be intended to appease the wrath of Telipinu; and in IV 3 obv. 12 ff. we have what may perhaps be taken as a striking confirmation of this view. The sense of this paragraph is very obscure; but the fact that the word *gal-liš-tar-ya-ni-li* follows *kar-ša-an-tén(-ma-za)* in line 12² and *kar-ša-an-za* in 15 (|| to GUD-un and GUD-uš respectively) suggests that the words belong closely together. Now *kallištaryanili* is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, but it seems to be composed of *kallištar* 'invitation (to a feast)' + the suffix which is found in *arayanni-*, *kulayana-*, *kuriyana-* (Sommer, *AU* 348¹) + adv. suff. *-ili*. Hence *karšanza kallīštaryanili* may well mean (an animal) 'selected for a feast.' The text appears to be an early one, and we may suppose that the later use of *karš-* alone in this special sense arose from the dropping of an adverb such as *kallištaryanili*.

If this solution is correct, 2 *BoTU* 23A II 29 and XII 43 11 require a different explanation.

C II 13. It is particularly unfortunate that the verb at the end of this line is lost, as it would be important for the meaning of *karš-* (see above) to know what is the result of the cessation of that activity.

1. In the only other text where *karšattar* occurs, namely, VIII 75 (II 10, IV 16, l.e. 7), it clearly means 'section' (of a field). Cf. Forrer in *Glotta*, XXVI 185.

2. Götze, *Madd.* 56, cites two passages where '*tin*' stands for *-tan-* in the 3 pl. pres. of verbs. Cf. also *ki-im-ma-an-tén* and *ha-mi-eš-ha-an-tén* in IV 4 obv. 3, 5. His solution, that the pronunciation was *tän*, seems probable; but it is not acceptable to Sturtevant (*HGr.* 45 fn. 27).

C II 14-17. Compare XIV 12 rev. 9-11 (*KlF*. I 238), where the use of *karš-* in the sense 'neglect' is perfectly clear. The verbs are most naturally taken as futures, and are in fact so taken by Götze, *loc. cit.* But then it is impossible to account for the pret. *harkta* in line 18. For this reason it has seemed necessary to translate the other verbs as presents.

17. *yašduli harteni*. XIV 12 rev. 11 has *ya-aš-túl har-te-e-ni* 'you will hold it a sin.' The present construction with acc. of the person is attested in XXI 29 III 43, 48: *na-an ya-aš-túl-li ap-pa-an-zi*. Cf. Sommer, *AU* 75.

C II 18=D I 8. *hattatar*. The gods Ea and Nabu are both described as *hattannaš* LUGAL-uš (see Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10 4¹; Götze, *Hatt.* 54² f.; Friedrich, *ZA*. NF. III 186 f.). Therefore Sommer, Ehelolf, and Friedrich equated *hattatar* with Accad. *nîmêqu* 'wisdom,' *bêl nîmêqi* being a common epithet of precisely these two gods. Götze, however, identified *hatta-* with *hanta-* 'fix, determine'=Accad. *šâmu*, and equated *hattatar* with Accad. *šimtu* 'fate.' Sommer, *HAB* 98 ff., has now shown that the stems *hanta-* and *hatta-* are everywhere distinguished and that additional material has confirmed his equation with *nîmêqu*. This might be doubted in the present passage, which is concerned not with the 'wisdom' of the gods, as an intellectual quality, but with their favour toward mankind. But in fact the word 'wisdom'—and indeed any single English word—is inadequate to express the Babylonian conception of *nîmêqu*. In Langdon's words: '*Nîmêqu* most often refers to the mystic knowledge of the priests of incantation and to the magic power of releasing mankind from sin and evil, an attribute especially associated with Ea the water god of Eridu. Hence Ea was the god to whom the title *bêl nîmêqi* ordinarily applies The 'wisdom' which the poet reveals [*i.e.* in the poem *ludlul bêl nîmêqi*] is the orthodox theory of deliverance by confession and mystic rites. It is of course true that *nîmêqu* is employed in the sense of 'knowledge,' but all knowledge was more or less tinged with a mystic aspect in Babylonia. 'Wisdom was essentially confined to the cult of the water god and the gods associated with that cult, especially Nebo god of writing and philosophy.'¹ Thus *nîmêqu* as well as *hattatar* has ethical implications and the present passage is but further proof of the equivalence of the two words.

1. Langdon, *Babylonian Wisdom*, 5-6 (= *Babyloniaca*, VII 133-4).

The omission of the final *r* in D (*ḥa-at-ia-ta¹-šum-mi-it*) is an example of a fairly common phenomenon, indicating a weak pronunciation of that letter; so also *miḫata*, A III 12. See Götze-Pedersen, *MS* 30 f.

i-ia-e-ni for *i-ia-u-e-ni*. The occasional omission of intervocalic *-u-* in Hittite has not been satisfactorily explained. Like that of the final *-r* it may indicate a weak pronunciation of the letter. See Sommer, *AU* 352, and Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 109a.

C II 19-22=D I 10-12. Compare *KlF.* I 218 3, where the same three alternatives are given in reverse order. These are the three methods recognized by the Hittites for ascertaining the will of the gods, namely, revelation by the mouth of an ecstatic (if the word *DINGIR-LIM-ni-ia-an-za* is correctly interpreted), communication in a dream, and interpretation of omens.¹

20. *DINGIR.MEŠ-niḫanza*, in the parallel passage written *LÚDINGIR-LIM-ni-ia-an-za*. There is no further evidence for the activity of this person. But the word should mean literally 'deified,' and since we are told that he 'speaks,' the meaning 'Gottesbegeisterter' conjectured by Götze in *KlF.* I 233 cannot be far wrong. See Ehelolf in *ZA. NF.* IX 177 f.

21. The parallel passage has for this line *ariḫašešnaz ḥandaḫattaru* 'let it be determined by the oracle.' The Hittites used three methods of divination, namely, by augury, by hepatoscopy, and by the 'KIN,'² administered by the 'bird-breeder' or 'augur,'³ the seer,⁴ and the 'old wife'⁵ respectively. Since the old wife and the seer are mentioned here, the restoration of the bird-breeder (*LÚMUŠEN.DÜ*) seems to be demanded.

This is a further instance of asyndesis with alternatives, to be added to those cited by Sommer, *AU* 157 f.

22. The parallel passage has *tešḫit uḫallu* 'let me see it in a dream.'

1. See Götze, *Kultur.* 139.

2. The nature of this type of oracle is obscure: probably some kind of lot. See Götze, *Kultur.* 140 f.; Boissier, *MBMH* 25-38.

3. *LÚMUŠEN.DÜ* and *LÚIGI.MUŠEN*.

4. Generally *LÚḪAL*, but occasionally, as here, *LÚAZU*, e.g. V 6 II 43. Elsewhere the latter is more often concerned in rituals of various kinds, though in *KBo.* IV 4 II 31 he is mentioned together with the *LÚMUŠEN.DÜ*.

5. *SAIŠU.GI*, as here.

Oneiromancy was not a regular type of divination, but anyone, including the king, might receive a divine communication in a dream.

The fourth clause in the parallel passage, which Götze interpreted as an allusion to 'incubation,' is omitted here.

C II 23=D I 13. This line expresses the general thought 'we will make amends' in a way which is no clearer in particular than when Götze discussed the same line in *KLF*, I 235.

The verb *kunk-* describes in VII 10 I 6 the preparation of the place for the ritual in the proper way (there with the preverb *anda*), while in XXIV 7 IV 39 it is an action performed by a joyful and loving father upon a baby after picking it up and before putting it in his lap.¹ In the new passage XXIX 1 III 43-4 (see p. 104) it certainly indicates some form of adornment. But the evidence is insufficient to determine whether the meaning is simply 'adorn' or something more specific.

URUDZI.KIN.BAR (=URUD^{še}-*pi-ik-ku-uš-ta-aš*) is a small copper object of little value, several of which may be worn by a bride on the head together with a head-band (*CH* §126; *KUB* XXVII 49 III 17 f.). It does not necessarily follow from *CH* §126 that it was to be found in the gate of the palace, for that may refer only to the *zahraiš*. In XVII 20 II 22 ZI.KIN.BAR follows *LI-'E* KUBABBAR 'writing tablets of silver' (the rest of the line is lost); hence 'stylus' ??? The *ša-pi-ik-ku-uš-ta-aš* URUD-*aš* of XVII 28 I 14 is probably the same article, but the context is unintelligible.²

GIŠ^š*arpa-* is connected on the one hand with agriculture and on the other with chairs and footstools.

- (a) X 92 V 11 ff. has the series (11) *DAš-ta-pi-en* (12) *DLAMA* (13) *GIŠAPIN GIŠšar-pa-an* (14) *DIr-ni-lu-ma-an* (15) *DZA-MĀ.MĀ*, etc.; thus the *GIŠšarpa-* of the plough, or the plough and the *GIŠšarpa-*, is/are here treated as divine.

VBoT 24 III 14 ff. The section is introduced by a list of requisites, headed by *A-ŠĀ te-ri-ip-pi-aš GIŠšar-pa-aš ha-aš-du-ir*

1. Reading *ÚR-ši da-a-iš*. This can hardly be separated from '*úr-ši ti-ja-u-en*, XXVII 66 III 17, where Götze (*MS* 22) would read *úr-ši* as equivalent to *KAS-ši*, i.e. 'we set on the way (to the *tuhukanti*).' But perhaps 'we put in the lap of the *tuhukanti*'?

2. Götze (*KLF*, I 235) supposes this object to be fastened on the pig, i.e. to be the obj. of *tar-ma-a-u-e-ni* (16). But this seems very doubtful in view of the preceding *na-an hu-i-nu-um-me-ni*.

'*haštuir* of ¹ GIŠšar-pa- of a ploughed field.' Then (27) *me-ir-ra-an-da-ia ha-aš-du-ir ú-da-an-zi* 'they bring in the merranda *haštuir*,' and (30) GIŠšar-pa-aš *ha-aš-du-ir me-ir-ra-an-da* (31) *ya-ar-nu-zi* 'he burns the merranda *haštuir* of the šarpa-.' The purpose of this is sympathetic magic: (42) 'As this *haštuir* has . . . (*arha merta*) for the ploughman, so for thee also, DĪLAMA of the shield (?), may anger hate and fury . . . (*arha mertu*).'

(b) *KBo.* V 2 I 31 ff.: 1 chair, 1 footstool, 1 KUŠšar-pa-aš, various garments (TUG), 1 pair of shoes.

VBoT 1 36: 3 chairs of *ušu* (?) -wood, šar-pa PA-NA[(in foll. line: 10 chairs of *ušu*-wood inlaid with ivory).

Bo. 703 obv. 9: GIŠšar-pa GUŠKIN GAR.RA I GIŠGİR.GUB GUŠKIN GAR.RA '1 šarpa inlaid with gold, 1 footstool inlaid with gold.'

Bo. 1224 I 8 f.

Sturtevant (*Chrest.* 123) infers from the Yale tablet (*VBoT* 24) that GIŠšarpaš *haštuir* means 'branches of brushwood.' But how can this be reconciled with the first passage in group (a) (dismissed by Sturtevant as a 'fragmentary line'!), not to speak of group (b)? Sturtevant's arguments are not conclusive, even for his text. Certainly *haštuir* is neut. pl., and the meaning 'branches' is not improbable, since in XXIV 14 I 7 it has the determinative GIŠ and seems to be part of a tree.² But the verb *mer-* is not proved to mean 'die.' The context and the analogy with XVII 10 III 14 ff. prove only that it denotes some manner of disappearance³; Sturtevant has apparently been influenced by his combination with Lat. *morior* (*HGr.* §§ 136, 139). Therefore we cannot say for certain that 'since the *haštuir* have died, they must once have been alive.' The word *may* not be used in its literal sense here. It is thus

1. 'šarpa- (and) *haštuir*' is also possible here. But whereas *haštuir* occurs alone in 27 and 42, šarpa- is never mentioned independently, and must therefore be a descriptive genitive.

2. XXIV 14 I 7 f.: *ha-aḫ-ha-ki-it-ti-inSAR e-u-ya-an GIŠha-aš-du-e-ir* (8) *ku-e-el im-ma GIŠru-ya-aš ha-aḫ-hal-la-aš a-li-il*. If line 8 is to be taken together, *haštuir* must be the name of a plant, like *haḫhaštiš* and *eyāš* (the latter occurs among plants in *KBo.* IV 2 I 10; cf. VII 55 obv. 6). This is evidently Friedrich's view in *ZA.* NF. V 80. But the double gen. in 8 is awkward and suggests that the division should come before *ha-aḫ-hal-la-aš*; we then have GIŠ*haštuir* *kuel imma GIŠru-ya-aš=haštuir* of any tree whatever (?).

3. Friedrich in *ZA.* NF. V 71² points out that in XVII 10 in a similar context the words used are *ya-ra-a-[nu]* 'let it burn' (III 15 f.), *te-ip-ša-u-e-eš[-du]* 'let it become small, shrink' (III 19 f., cf. C II 53 below), and *pa-id-du* 'let it depart' (IV 8 f.). But the passage from *Bo.* 2616 quoted by Friedrich on p. 80 is most puzzling.

difficult to use the Yale tablet as evidence for *GIŠšarpa-*. The other texts all suggest some manufactured article or 'implement' rather than a natural 'wood.' Götze infers from X 92 V 13 that it is probably some religious symbol, but this applies only to its use in that text; properly it has no more connexion with religion than the 'plough' which precedes it. As regards group (b), I am unable to find any adjunct of chairs that the word might denote. Hence the available evidence does not permit a closer definition of *GIŠšarpa-*.

Such is the evidence for the words in this line. Obscure though it is, it at least enables us to criticise previous suggestions. According to Götze (*loc. cit.*), the line denotes some religious act at a sacred symbol. But there is no evidence that any of these words is essentially connected with religion. Sturtevant suggests 'and we shall decorate (?) the statues (?) with *verbenae*.' Of this, 'decorate' is possible; but 'statues' cannot be worn on the head, nor can 'verbenae' be inlaid with gold (see above). Forrer's ingenious guess 'we will pull the nails out of the tally'¹ actually misconstrues the form of the sentence; for the construction with acc. and abl. is clearly impossible with this verb, and *GIŠšarpaz* must be taken (with Sturtevant) in an instrumental sense. The approximate sense must be 'we will prepare (adorn, decorate?) (the?) pins (amulets?) with (a?)'. In view of the secular associations of the words, it seems more likely that this is a metaphorical expression drawn from everyday life, of the kind suggested by Forrer, than a specifically religious act of gratitude.

C II 25 f.=D I 15 f. *tamašta* is 3 sg. pres. med.-pass. Cf. *KlF*. I 164.8, 172.13, and V 6 II 38 (Sommer, *AU* 281). Whether the verb is passive (Götze) or impersonal (Sommer) it is impossible to say until a passage is found where the person affected has a clear case-ending.

C II 25 ff.=D I 15 ff. The speaker now turns from the sufferings caused by the pestilence to those inflicted by the neighbouring countries; for these have risen in rebellion against the land of Hatti, and so, he argues, since they have broken the oaths to which the gods had given

1. *Forsch.* II 18. According to Forrer, 'debts seem in the Hatti-empire to have been registered by nails, which presumably were driven through the creditor's stick and so produced holes in the stick of the debtor.' The idea is perfectly logical. On payment of the debt the creditor would then pull out the nails. But unfortunately this would make the men of Hatti the creditors instead of the debtors, which is impossible in the context.

their guarantee, justice demands that the plague should be driven out of the land and turned against these impious kingdoms. He has thus introduced a section which is of great importance (i) for the relation of Hurri to Mitanni and the meaning of the word *hur-la-*, (ii) for the meaning of *kuriyana-*, and (iii) for the dating of the text.

(i) The fact that *Hur-la-aš* KUR-*e* in D corresponds to KUR URUMi-it-ta-an-ni in C proves only the approximate equivalence of the two terms, for in other texts they are clearly distinguished.¹ The phrase *Hur-la-aš* KUR-*e* (also in IX 1 II 30) is an instance of the remarkable absence of determinatives, whether geographical (URU) or personal (LÚ.MEŠ), which is characteristic of the word *hur-la-*, especially in the early texts, and which can only be explained by the assumption that *hur-la-* was originally an appellative and not a geographical term. The matter has been discussed by Forrer (*KlF.* I 256 f.), Sommer (*AU* 42-8), Götze (*Kultur.* 57²), and Ungnad (*Subartu* § 117). Both Hittite *hur-la-s* and Accadian *HURRI* seem to be renderings of the native term *hurru-he*, the meaning of which still escapes us,² but there is much to be said for Sommer's view that the actual form of the Hittite word, and perhaps also of the Accadian, is due to 'popular etymology,' since *hur-lu-uš* (acc. pl.) is found in VII 55 obv. 5 as an appellative, apparently denoting some kind of animal, and *HURRI* is the gen. of the Accadian word for 'cave.' Thus Hrozný's suggestion in *AOr.* I 98 that the name *hurri* is 'derived' from the caves round Urfa would represent the point of view of the Accadians, but would not be historically correct.³

It seems very likely that the rebellion of Mittanni was instigated by Aššur-uballiṭ of Aššur, since the Assyrians are described as constituting a menace in the neighbourhood of Carchemish in the second year of the reign: see Forrer, *Forsch.* II 36 f., Götze, *AM* 26-9. Yet Mittanni continues to lead a shadowy existence as a buffer state for many years, and although there is nowhere any mention of a campaign to reconquer

1. See Götze, *Kultur.* 174¹; Hrozný, *AOr.* I 91 ff., 252-3.

2. Sommer (*AU* 46) remarks that we do not even know whether it was a proper name or an appellative derived perhaps from some geographical conception such as 'mountain(s), plain' or the like. Ungnad (*Subartu*, p. 131) suggests 'league,' but with remarkable diffidence. The name of the god '*hur*'-me/be/pa, cited by Ungnad, *ibid.* 131⁴, is to be read *Harve*: for in the Nuzi texts (Chiera, *Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi*), *IA-ri-ḥar-pa* (no. 262 23) = *IA-ri-ḥa-ar-me-e* (no. 40 27), and *IKi-iz-ḥar-be* (no. 252 34) = *IKi-zi-ḥa-ar-pa* (no. 201 28).

3. Note, however, that the Hurrian suffix *-hi/e* causes a preceding *i* to become *u* (Friedrich, *Anal. Or.* XII 126³, *ZDMG* 91 211). Thus *hurri* may be a genuine 'Hurrian' word, and the resemblance to *hurru* 'cave' accidental.

the country, Mursili manœuvres freely along the Euphrates and even celebrates late in his reign the 'festival of the Malās-river' which presumably involved a peaceful journey to the extreme eastern boundary of Mittanni.¹ A Mittannian contingent is even mentioned at the battle of Kadesh. Evidently the Assyrians were at this time ready to take advantage of any sign of weakness in the Hittite realm, but never felt equal to a trial of strength with a Hittite army.² The only alleged encounter between the two powers, in Mursili's ninth year, rests on a conjectural restoration of *KBo.* IV 4'II 40 ff.³

The history of this period is discussed by Cavaignac in *RHA* III 118 ff. and in his book, *Subbiliturima et son temps*, pp. 81-5.

(ii) For the meaning of *kuriyana*-/*kuiryana*-, in which Forrer in 1924 claimed to have found the prototype of the Gk. *κοίπavos*, the present passage has been recognised by all Hittitologists as the *locus classicus*. For the arguments in detail it must be sufficient to refer to Forrer, *OLZ*, 1924, 117, and *MDOG* 63.19; Friedrich, *Vert.* I 76; Götze, *Madd.* 140 ff.; Forrer, *KlF.* I 266 ff.; Sommer, *AU* 342-8 and 392-5; and Götze, *Kultur.* 91-2, on which Sommer, *OLZ* 38 (1935) 280.

The following points may be noted here :

(a) Grammatical. *kuriyanaš* with KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-TIM is most naturally taken as an adjective, the ideogram representing the Hittite form *udneḫanteš* (Sommer, *AU* 342-4). Since Forrer's arguments (*KlF.* I 266 f.) have been proved invalid, the mere possibility of its being a noun in the gen. pl. is no longer attractive. The neuter pronoun *kye*, which is now restored through the addition of Bo. 3556 (unknown to Sommer when he wrote), is quite compatible with this interpretation, for the irregular use of the neuter *kē* with substantives in the 'personal' gender is common (see Friedrich, *Vert.* I 38, Götze, *AM* 203 ff., and Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 258), and a similar use of *kye*, which shows the same peculiarities as *kē* in the matter of number (*BoSt.* 10.48) is not surprising.

1. Cf. Götze, *Kultur.* 174¹, and Cavaignac, *RHA* III 119. Götze suggests identification with the Batman- or Bitlis-Su, Cavaignac with the Ḫabur. But geographical problems cannot be discussed here.

2. Cf. XIV 16 I 18-19: 'When the Assyrian received news that "troops and chariots of Ḫatti have come," he accordingly did not come.' The apparent quiescence of the Assyrians is also explained by the fact that the successors of Assurballit, who died soon after Mursili's accession, were occupied with wars in the South and elsewhere.

3. Götze, *AM* 116 (cf. 247 and 12). If the Assyrians had really taken Carchemish, the consequences would surely have been far more serious. Cf. Cavaignac, *RHA* III 11.

For *kē* a close parallel is *ki-e a-ra-aḥ-zé-na-aš* KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚKÚR (KBo. III 4 I 28 f.).

(b) Semantic. *kuriyanaš* is used in this passage to describe the officially recognized political status of Mittanni, Arzawa and Kizzuwatna in their relation to Ḫatti, and this status is known exactly from the extant treaties made with two of them by Suppiluliuma. Further, the lands whose status is regulated by treaty (it is only upon such that the vengeance of the gods can be invoked) are here divided sharply into *kuriyana*-lands and lands that belong to Ḫatti. The exact legal interpretation of the Mattiwaza and Sunassura treaties—whether these princes are to be classed as vassals (Korošec¹), as protégés (Götze) or as equals (Sommer) is a somewhat academic question, as the terms of these treaties, taken as a whole, reflect in each case the special conditions under which they were made (cf. Korošec, *op. cit.* 54). These conditions have been well described by Sommer (AU 394). We have rather to find in these treaties that particular factor in virtue of which Kizzuwatna and Mittanni (in relation to Ḫatti), Attarissiyas (in relation to the king of Ḫatti), and the Arzawa-chieftains (in relation to each other), can be described by the same term; and I agree entirely with Sommer that this factor is their (relative) independence in the sense that, either owing to the terms of a treaty or to the fact that no treaty existed, neither party was subject to the commands of the other. This subjection was symbolized by the payment of tribute,² a perfectly definite criterion, which accounts for the sharp distinction between the two classes of allies. See below on C II 42=D I 28.

(c) Etymological. The equation with *κοίρανος* is very uncertain. According to Sommer (AU 347 f.), **κοιρFavos* is an impossible form, and the earliest ascertainable meaning of the word is 'leader of troops.'

(iii) On the date of the texts see introduction, pp. 12-14.

C II 27=D I 16 (Bo. 3556). *a-ra-aḥ-ḥa-an-da*. Sommer (HAB 50⁴) finds the neuter difficult to account for. But it is surely adverbial (sc. *ašanzi, kijaṇtari*). 'ḥa' for 'za' also X 95 III 2, and in this same word in KUB I 11 IV 25.

C II 28=D I 17 (Bo. 3556). *ḥumanza* masc. sg. (as remarked by

1. *Hethitische Staatsverträge* (= *Leipziger rechtswissenschaftliche Studien*, Heft 60), 6-8.
2. See Korošec, *op. cit.* 49 and 82 ff.

Sommer, *HAB* 50⁴); a further proof that KUR.KUR-TIM=*udnejanter*. It is unlikely that *humanza* means 'each man, everybody.'

šulleit. The verb *šulla(i)-* and its cognates are generally taken to mean 'quarrel,' but this is no more than approximate. Sommer (*HAB* 41) has indeed established the equation with Accadian *šelû* 'quarrel,' and considers the original meaning to be 'attack, deal with angrily,' i.e. a transitive meaning. Anger, however, as an emotional reaction to a stimulus, is not expressed by this word so much as the outward actions which are typical of an angry person. For it is used most commonly as here of rebellious vassals, who in the eyes of the overlord are necessarily committing *unprovoked* aggression; the passages quoted by Sommer (*KBo.* V 8 II 2, *Man.* A I 68 f., *Taw.* IV 39),¹ where the subordinate is the object and the subject is the overlord, are exceptional. In IX 15 II 14 and 21 the verb is parallel to *uallizi* and *hurtai*. Hence 'scold, revile,' which Sommer previously suggested for these transitive passages, seems more likely to be original.²

nu-za-an in D clearly=*nu-z-šan* before *šarā* (Götze, *AOr.* V 30 f., Sommer, *HAB* 114⁴, 178), in spite of *nu-za-kán* in C.

C II 28 f.=D I 18. *šarā iā-* occurs only here, to my knowledge, but is presumably equivalent to *šer iā-*, for which the meaning 'exalt, celebrate' (Sturtevant, *HGL.* 184) is attested in XI 13 VI 12 and XXI 17 III 8. However, it is difficult to account for the combination of *šarā* with *iā-*, which is not a verb of motion, for *šarā* regularly implies motion (Götze, *Hatt.* 70 ff.).

šarrantati. The use of the med.-pass. of this verb as equivalent to the active is common: see Friedrich, *Vert.* I 27, also I 16 II 50 (obj. *uttar*) and *Madd.* rev. 20 (obj. *lingain*).

D I 19. *italayanni šanh-* is a common phrase, see Sommer, *BoSt.* 7 54, Friedrich, *Vert.* I 175 ff.

C II 30=D I 22. *layarruna*. Götze (*AM* 228 f.) points out that the ending *-una* is used both in this word and in *ta-pa-ru-na*, XIX 29

1. A logically similar passage is XIX 39 III 10: *ku-in šu-ul-la-an-ni ú-e-ku-un* 'whom I demanded for reproof (?)' (Götze, *AM* 167, 'zum Streit').

2. In IV 4 obv. 6 *šu-ul-la-an-ni* is rendered in Accadian by *a-na . . . -ši šī-ik-na-at na-piš-ti*. The verb is unfortunately illegible, but the only possible reading that gives a satisfactory Accadian word seems to be *uš-šu-ši*, II 1, inf. of *ašāku* 'to be troubled.' In any case the words are not an exact translation (see Götze, *Hatt.* 92).

IV 21, where we should expect the infin. in *-anna*—the regular form with *šanh-* (Sommer, *BoSt.* 7 55 f.; Friedrich, *Vert.* II 22; Götze, *NBr.* 28 ff.). He suggests that the form is Luwian, which seems very likely, as both *layar-* and *tapar-* elsewhere have the Glossenkeil.

The only occurrence of *layar-* is in the 'protocol' XIII 35 II 28 ff. :

- 28 GIŠBAN.ĪI.A GUSKIN G[AR.RA¹ k]u-e SAL.LUGAL
kap-pu-u-ya-it
 29 nu-ya-ra-at he-e-š[a²- la]-ya-ar-ri-ma ú-e-mi-ja-nu-un
 30 GUŠKIN-ya-za ú-ug[Ū-UL (?)²] da-aḥ-ḥu-un
 31 GIŠBAN.ĪI.A-ja-ya-za a-pi-i[zi³ Ū-U]L da-aḥ-ḥu-un
 32 a-pid-da-ja-ya Ū-UL I-D[I⁴ nam-m]a²-ya-ra-at la-ya-ar-ri-it-ta
 33 GIM-an-ma-ya-ra-at u-uh-ḥu-[un] nu-ya-za-kán še-ir na-a-ḥu-un
 34 nu-ya GUŠKIN ŠA AMA-IA d[a-a]ḥ-ḥu-un nu-ya-ra-at a-pi-e-iz¹
 35 ḥa-lí-iš-ši-ja-nu-un a-pi-i[a]-ma-ya-ra-at ku-it
 36 Ū-UL AQ-BI UM-MA¹ Pal-la-a LUŠKÛ.DÍM SAG.KI-i-ya-
mu-kán
 37 li-e ti-ja-ši nu a-pid-da-an AS¹-KUT⁴

'The bows [verlaid with] gold, which the queen counted (?),⁵ I found them . . . [. la]yarrima. The gold I had [not ?]⁶ taken, and the bows I had [no]t taken the[nce (?)] ; and therefore I did not know [and the]n (?) they *layaritta*. Now when I saw that, I was afraid about it, and I took the gold of my mother and overlaid them with that ;

1. Götze, *Madd.* 121, reads 4?]. But cf. 34 ff.

2. See note on translation. The lacuna is large, but the signs are spaced out in this line.

3. Not *a-pi-e* 'those,' since the demonstrative pronoun, when used as an attribute, always precedes its noun. See Sommer, *AU* 153.

4. The text has 'ug'-'tar,' which is unintelligible. I do not know of any actual instance of 'ug' for 'az' elsewhere in the Bo. texts but the signs are very similar, and the sense must be 'I was silent.'

5. So apparently Götze, *Madd.* 121, but this does not make very good sense. Perhaps restore *-mu* in the lacuna, and translate 'counted over to me, gave into my charge.'

6. The insertion of *Ū-UL* is suggested by the following line, where we should otherwise expect *-ma-* 'but' rather than *-ja-* 'and.' But the restoration depends primarily on the general sense. Why was the accused afraid when he found the bows in the condition described in 29 and 32? If he had *not* taken the gold, he may well have been afraid of punishment for neglect, owing to some damage that the bows had suffered during his absence. But if he had already taken the gold off the bows, and had thus not been afraid to commit a theft, it is hardly likely that he would be so affected by any subsequent change in their condition ; at least such a fear would be quite illogical, since he would have been liable to severe punishment in any case. H. Otten has pointed out to me that in a previous paragraph the culprit presents the stolen goods to his mother (II 16), and infers that the 'gold of my mother' is the very gold which he had taken from the bows. This is possible, but we should have expected some mention of the fact that the gold had been presented to his mother ; the words 'of my mother' seem to distinguish that gold from the other.

and if (whereas) I did not mention it at the time, Pallā the goldsmith said "Do not denounce me" and for that reason I kept silence.'

If the restoration of the negative in l. 30 is correct (see p. 97 n. 6), the sentence may still be taken in two different ways according to the emphasis. If the emphasis is on the gold (as opposed to the bows), then *layarritta* is something that had happened while the gold was still on the bows.¹ But in fact the addition of *ú-ug* clearly shows that the emphasis is on 'I.' Read in this way, line 30 implies that the gold had in fact been taken, but not by the speaker. The robbery of the gold must then be stated in the previous line, and in particular by the words *layarrima yemiñanun*. I cannot explain the earlier part of this line, since the only known word beginning with *he-e-ša-* is *hešanzi* 'they open' and this is impossible in the context; but the damage is evidently contained in the word *layarrima*, since *layarritta* alone is considered sufficient to describe it in line 32. There is thus strong probability—owing to the lacunae in the text it cannot be called proof—that *layarrima yemiñanun* = 'I found them despoiled'² and *layarritta* = 'they were despoiled'; and moreover 'to despoil' is exactly what is required for the active form *layarruna* in the present passage.

If the restoration of the negative in line 30 is not correct, one is obliged to adopt some meaning such as Götze's 'had come in two' (Götze, *AM* 229) for *layarritta*. But only a very general translation, such as 'were smashed, broken,' can be reconciled with the present passage, and it would be strange to find such an unusual word for this.

C II 31=D I 20. *kattayātār*. Sommer, *HAB* 50 f., has proved that *kattayātār* = 'revenge, vengeance' by the new reading of 2 *BoTU* 8 II 22, where *[ka]t-ta-ya-a-tar ša-an-ḫi-eš-ki[-u-an-zi]* = Accad. *gi₅-mi-lam [a-]na tu-úr-ri*. For other passages see Sommer, *loc. cit.*

Sommer would take *na-at* in the present passage and in II 51 f. as referring to the land of Hatti, on account of the use of *namma* 'again,' and because in 51 f. (and in fact also here) the enemy-countries are treated as masc. pl. and therefore *na-at . . . ki-ša-ru* cannot refer to them. The first argument I do not understand; the second is true, but

1. For instance, the gold might have come loose and fallen off, implying bad workmanship. This would fully explain the attitude of Pallā the goldsmith, if we could suppose that the latter had been responsible for the original plating, not, as argued by Sommer (*AU* 186), for the subsidiary operation with the mother's gold only.

2. Perhaps *layarrima* is a Luwian adj. containing the IE participial suffix *-mo*.

does not prove that *na-at*=the land of Ḫatti. Against Sommer it must be urged (a) that in C five lines have intervened since the last mention of Ḫatti, and so the reference would be far from clear, and (b) that *kattarātar* means not 'an avenging' but 'a taking vengeance on,' as demonstrated by Sommer himself from 425/c obv. 23, 1780/c II 33, Bo. 2823 III (?) 8-13, and *KUB XIII 7 I 14 ff.* The interpretation here given, according to which *na-at* refers to the whole matter just described, is supported by *KUB IV 1 I 22 f.* *na-at A-NA DINGIR.MEŠ me-ik-ki kat-ta-ya-tar e-eš-du*, where the opponents are the Kaska-folk and the god Zithariya, and therefore the subject of the sentence can only be the dispute (*DĪNU*=*ḫaneššar* 'law-suit') itself.

C II 33. *tapaššan*. There is no doubt that this word denotes an illness of some kind: cf. *a-ši INIM GIG (KBo. II 2 II 26)* and *A-NA GIG DUTU-ŠI (ibid. 29)* referring to the *tapašša*- which is the subject of this text. Further: *ta-pa-aš-ša-za* (V 2 10) parallel with *KALAG.GA-za UG₆-za* (6), *[K]ALA[G[?].GA-z]a[?] GIG-za UG₆-za* (2), and *UG₆-za* (15); *KALAG.GA-aš ta-pa-aš-ša-aš* (V 4 I 20 in a passage like the early part of *KBo. II 2*); *e-ni INIM GIG (VI 14 rev. 14)*, another similar text: cf. *ibid. 10 UMMa SALḪa-ta[] ta-pa-aš-ša-aš-ya te-pu-uš e-eš-zi*; also IX 34 II 1, XVI 4 6, XVIII 12 II 11, 15. These texts mostly consist of questions put to the oracle as to whether a *tapašša*- will befall the king at a certain time or place, which suggests that it was an illness involving recurrent attacks at unpredictable intervals. They thus provide additional support for the translation 'fever, malaria (?)' and the etymological connexion with Sanskrit *tāpas*- 'heat' and Latin *tepor* suggested by Hrozný in *BoSt.* 3 30³.

C II 34-37=D I 23-24. The translation given by Götze in *KlF.* I 196 is valueless for several reasons. He has mistakenly read *ta!-ri-ia-an-da-an* in 36 (Götze '35'), thus introducing an illusory simplicity into the last two lines of the paragraph. Had he read *ta!-ri-ia-an-da-an* correctly in 36, he could not have translated it 'beanspruchtes' and so would have seen that this translation is equally impossible in 35. He has entirely omitted to translate *-ma* in 35; and he supplies an optative form of the copula ('sollen sein'), whereas Sommer (*AU* 452 and 168) has observed that the copula is only omitted when it would stand in the present.

For the solution of this passage our starting-point must be lines 36-7.

There are intrinsically two possible interpretations of these lines: either (a) *yaršijant-* implies a sin which deserves the punishment of *tarija-* 'harnessing' and *tarija-* is a merit which deserves the reward of *lā-* 'releasing,' or (b) it is the *tarijanteš* who ought to be released and the *yaršijanteš* harnessed, not (as at present) vice versa. However, (a) can only be made intelligible by forcing the meaning of the words; for *yaršijant-* in this context must mean 'rested,' in which it is difficult to see a sin, and neither harnessing nor releasing are natural words for punishment and reward. The only advantage of (a) is that it is possible to derive *tarijant-* from the known verb *tarija-* 'call upon (a god),' assuming a development such as 'calling upon, *supplex*, humble, repentant'; though even so the participle should be passive, not active. On the other hand (b) is immediately intelligible as a metaphor from the science of horse-training, if *tarijant-* may be combined with the subst. *tarrijašhaš* (see above on C I 48) and given the meaning 'tired.' In fact we need not hesitate to follow Götze (*ap. Sturtevant, HGL* 153) in positing a second verb *tarija-* 'to grow weary, take pains,' for the hypothesis is extremely enlightening. There can be no doubt that we have the same word in *tar-ri-ja-an-za*[, *KBo.* II 8 I 26, applied to a cow (ÁB.MAH), and in *tar-ja-an-da-an*, XII 63 obv. 9, applied to a bull (also with *ya-a[r-ši-ja-an-da-an]*?). And in XXI 27 IV 38 ff. *tarijat* is claimed by Götze for *tarija-*='take pains' with some justification: (38) *IHa-at-tu-ši-li-i[š-š]a IR-KA A-NA ZI DINGIR-LIM* (39) *še-ir da-ri-ja-at nu-za a-pi-e[-el] S[AG].DU-an ZI-ŠÚ-ja* (40) *uš-ša-ni-iš-ki-it ku-it-ma-an [ŠA DINGIR-LIM EN-IA* (41) *URUNe-ri-ik-ka-an a-aš-ši-ja-an-t[a-an UR]U-an EGIR-pa* (42) *i-e-te-it*='And Hattusili, thy servant, has been zealous on behalf of the god, and was selling hi[s own (?) (za!)] head and soul (an expression for taking endless pains?) until he had rebuilt Nerik, the beloved city of the god my lord.' It is even very possible that *anda tarija-*, which occurs in *KBo.* IV 12 obv. 7 (Götze, *Hatt.* 40) as a treatment for a disease (and in a mutilated passage XXVI 33 III 11), belongs to this verb and means 'take pains about (the patient).' Thus *tarija-*='take pains' is well established, and the spellings *tar-ri-* (in *tarrijašhaš*) and *tar-ja-* (in XII 63 obv. 9) suggest that the pronunciation differed from that of *tarija-* 'invoke.'¹

1. The latter verb is actually less well established than the former; for the meaning 'invoke' was proved by Götze (*Hatt.* 100) only for *tarijanu-*, and there is no published text in which it is unequivocally required for *tarija-*. Passages where the meaning 'take pains' is possible are mentioned above. XXI 19 III 37, 38 I 37, and XXVI 33 III 11

This being so, the 'tired land' in 35 is clearly the land of Ḫatti, and *ANA*, which is inserted in C, is superfluous. This is well explained by Sommer, *HAB* 156², as a dictation mistake due to misunderstanding of the Hittite word *udne*; *I-NA* is inserted for the same reason in A IV 17 (q.v.). (But how is the insertion of *A-NA* in *HT* 1 I 39 before EN É-*TIM* (rightly omitted in the duplicate IX 31 I 48) to be explained?)

These lines thus form a kind of picturesque epilogue suggested by and explaining in metaphorical language the vengeance demanded in the preceding line: hence the asyndesis in 34.

C II 39=D I 25 f. 'They were swine-herds and weavers of linen.' What is the point of this line? According to Götze, *Kultur*g. 168, it is intended to stigmatize the Gasga-folk as barbarians—which in fact they must have been. But surely weavers would not be thought especially barbarous. However, this might well be true of swineherds. Ramsay has pointed out the distinction that obtained in the post-Hittite period between the 'pig-eaters' and the 'pig-haters': 'Whatever be its origin, the difference between western Asia Minor and Greece on the one hand, and eastern Asia Minor, beginning with Pessinus, on the other, is most striking. In the west the pig is used in the holiest ceremonies; its image accompanies the dead to their graves to purify them, and the living wash with their own hands (in Greece at least) the pig which is to be their sacrifice. In the east the very presence of the pig in the holy city (Komana Pontica) is a profanation and impurity. My theory of explanation is that the religion which prevailed throughout Asia Minor in early time was the religion of a northern race which had no horror of the pig, and that Semitic influence subsequently introduced that horror into the eastern parts of the country' (*Historical Geography*, 31 f.). Among the Hittites pigs were indeed reared, but were not highly valued, as is shown by the fact that in the section of the Code which is concerned with offences in connexion with animals (mostly theft), the order is GUD.MAḪ 'bull?' (§ 57), ANŠU.KUR.RA.MAḪ 'stallion?' (§ 58), UDU.A.LUM (§ 59), GUD.APIN.LAL 'plough-ox'

are valueless owing to mutilation. There remain only *Ḫatt.* IV 21 and XXIV 9 III 14+10 III 7+11 III 5. But of the former, Götze's translation is unsatisfactory (why not *dārijat* 'she summoned'?), and Sturtevant's interpretation of *in-na-(a-)ya-u-ya-aš-ma-aš* as *innara-ya-šmaš* (*Chrest.* 79, 97) is impossible on account of the spelling; and the latter, *UM-MA DUMU.LÚ.GÁL.LU-(TI)-ma ta-ri-ja-u-en UM-MA* (var. *namma*) *ALAN.ḪI.A ú-da-at-ten*, I cannot translate. Admittedly, however, no better sense can be obtained with *tarija*- 'take pains.'

(§ 63), ANŠU.KUR.RA *tīriḡayaš* 'horse for harnessing' (§ 64), MAŠ.GAL 'goat' (§ 65), GUD.ĀB 'cow' (§ 67), ANŠU.KUR.RA SAL.AL.LAL 'mare' (§ 68), UDU.SIG+SAL 'ewe?' and UDU.NITÁ 'ram' (§ 69), 'ox—horse—mule—ass' (§ 70); then after several paragraphs dealing with other offences connected with these animals, ŠAH 'pig' of various kinds (§§ 81-86), UR.TÚG 'dog' of various kinds (§§ 87-90), and finally NIM.LAL.HI.A 'bees' (§§ 91-2). The pig and the dog were evidently in certain circumstances regarded as unclean, since in *KUB* XIII 4 their approach is three times said to cause defilement (I 20, III 60 and 64). In a religious context the pig is used solely in the purification-rituals—and there frequently—for magical purposes; the two texts quoted by Götze, *Kultur*. 153, as evidence for the use of the pig for sacrifice are actually of this kind. Thus the Hittites may well have despised the swine-herd.

e-eš-šir. The spelling of a part of *eš*- 'to be' with -šš- is unique, unless *e-eš-ša-an-zi* in C I 19 (see p. 61) is to be so explained. D has the normal form *e-še-ir*. The pronunciation would be much the same, but *e-eš-šir* ought to be from *ešša*- 'to make,' and Dr. Zuntz has suggested to me that the scribe has been influenced by the idea of making contained in *E-PIŠ KAT*.

Note the conjunction in a purely parenthetical sentence—perhaps because it is not explanatory but additional.

C II 38-41=D I 25-27. The home of the Gasga men is in the hills to the north of Hattusas, extending roughly from the sources of the Halys in the east to the lower waters of the same river in the west. Arawanna and Kalasma are west of the Halys, probably in Paphlagonia. The Lugga Lands and Pitassa are in the south-west. These localisations are in accordance with the conclusions already obtained by other scholars¹; they can be demonstrated, however, only in the course of a comprehensive investigation of Hittite geography, an investigation which I hope shortly to be able to undertake.

If these five districts were Hittite possessions at the beginning of the reign of Mursili II, they must have been conquered by Suppiluliuma,

1. For the Gasga area see Götze, *RHA* I 18-30; for Arawanna, Forrer in *Real. Ass. I s.v.*; for the Lugga lands, Forrer, *MDOG* 63.4 and *Forsch.* I 80, Schachermeyr, *MAG* IX 56 f., Kretschmer, *Glotta* XXIV 235; for Pitassa, Götze, *Madd.* 153, Garstang, *Hittite Empire*, 179. The different scheme advocated by Hrozný in *AOr.* VII 133 ff. is based on insufficient evidence.

a fact of which we have direct information only in the case of the Gasga lands. The passage is thus a valuable supplement to the historical record of Suppiluliuma's reign.

C II 42=D I 28. *arāṣṣta/arāṣṣīr*. *arāṣṣiṣ*=*ELLUM*, *KBo.* I 45 obv. 4; and the meaning 'free' in a social sense is certain both for this and for the simple form *a-ra-(a-)u-e-eš* (nom. pl.) from the passages in the Code, *KBo.* VI 3 III 4 and 26 III 45. The present passage proves that in a political sense to become free was to cease to pay tribute, and hence that the payment of tribute is the criterion which distinguished a Hittite possession from a *kuriyana*-land.¹ Sommer has already pointed out in *AU* 346 that *ELLUM* becomes in a political sense practically equivalent to *kuriyanaš*, having even the same relative limitations. But this does not prove that the original meanings were the same.

DUTU URU*Arinna*. This section of the prayer (C II + D) is not addressed to the Sun-goddess, as stated by Sommer, *AU* 344, but to the gods in general, as pointed out in the introduction. But this goddess was the embodiment of the state (see Götze, *Kultur*. 128), and so a revolt of subjects was peculiarly her affair. This accounts for the frequent reference to her in lines 38-53, and it is true that in 52-3 the speaker actually abandons the third person and addresses her directly. But he returns immediately to 'the gods' in 54.

C II 42-3 (=D II 1). *arḫa peššēir*. This compound verb means 'cast away,' and is used both of the vassal who repudiates (as here) and of the king who remits the tribute; see Zuntz, *Ortsadv.* 31 (also *KBo.* VI 29 III 30, *ap.* Götze, *NBr.* 50).

argamuš. That *arga(m)ma(na)*- is a loan-word from Accad. *argamannu* 'purple' was suggested by Götze, *Madd.* 130 f.,² though with some hesitation on account of the 'Glossenkeil' in certain places (*ibid.* 131⁴). It may therefore be worth while to cite in this connexion what appears to be a Glossenkeil before the Accad. word *terānu* in V 6 III 70, though an isolated instance in an oracle-text is of very little value as evidence. The diagonal wedge before *IK-ŠU-UD* in IX 7 rev. 13 indicates the inseting of the line.

1. See Sommer, *AU* 344, where this line is translated.

2. Now also in *Md. Ped.* 491.

C II 44-5 // D II 2-3. The texts vary considerably here, as noted in the transcription, and will therefore be dealt with separately.

C II 44. [-i]a='and,' not 'also' (cf. Forrer, *Forsch.* I 241, and Sommer, *AU* 212), proved by the fact that D has *nu*. The particle (-i)a is used as a sentence-connective with sentences which are more closely connected logically with the previous sentence than are those where *nu* is used, or in Sommer's words 'where a parallel action is added' (Sommer, *loc. cit.*). The usage is thus not far removed from complete asyndesis as in 'explanatory clauses.' This is in fact a kind of explanatory sentence, explaining how, as indicated by *appa* in 43, the attacks on Hatti are in the nature of reprisals. *yalħanneškiyan dāir* is picked up again after the parenthesis in 49-50.

IŠTU DUTU URUArinna. For the abl. (represented by IŠTU) = 'by the agency of,' 'with the help of,' cf. *KBo.* VI 29 I 10 (Götze, *Hatt.* 44) IŠ-TU DINGIR-LIM-mu (11) *pa-ra-a pa-ra-a* SIG₇-iś-kat-ta-ri, and *Hatt.* I 39 *nu* DINGIR-LIM-za *pār-ku-(u)-e-eś-šu-un*. (Also DUTU-az, 2 *BoTU* 7 11 ?)

C II 45. UR.MAḪ *mān*. The construction of *mān* = 'as' following a noun is now dealt with by Sommer, *HAB* 75 f., *q.v.* He cites the following passages: 2 *BoTU* 7 I 26, 8 II 46, 10,3 I 15, *KUB* VIII 48 I 18+53 6 (cited *AU* 126¹), XI 23 VI 7, XXIV 7 III 26, *Bo.* 706 rev. 27 (*OLZ*, 1933, 4), *Bo.* 2544 II 18, 22 (*ZA*, NF. IX 176), and *Bo.* 2865 II 22 f.

In other similar comparisons the particle is written GIM-an, and this is interpreted by Götze (-Pedersen, *MS* 58) as the comparative *ma-aḫ-ḫa-an* (sic!) as a postposition with the genitive. But the only example quoted by him is UR.MAḪ-aś GIM-an, XXIV 7 III 24, which, as pointed out by Sommer (*loc. cit.*), is followed only two lines later by *ḫu-u-ya-an ḫu-e-śar ma-a-an* 'like a wave'; Sommer therefore supposed that GIM-an also represented *mān* in this construction. But the new volume *KUB* XXIX has provided proof that *maḫhan* also may be so used. For in XXIX 1 III 43-4 we read: *na-at-za-kán ša-a-ša-aś ma-aḫ-ḫa-an ku-un-ki-iś-kán-ta-ri* 'they are dressed up (?)¹ like šāśaś' (an animal²), parallel to Á.MUŠEN.ḪI.A GI[M]-an 'like eagles' in line 50. And in XXIX 7 rev. 21-2: *i-da-a-lu-ja ut-tar NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM ḫu-u[r-ta-iś]*

1. The passage does not exclude some more positive meaning. See above, pp. 90 ff.

2. Parallel to UR.MAḪ in *KBo.* III 8 III 11 ff.: in 13 it apparently produces milk.

pa-ap-ra-a-tar ha-šu-ua-a-iSAR ma-a-aḥ-ha-an an-da pu-uš-ša-id-du 'may the evil word, the divine oath, the curse (and) the uncleanness like the *hašuwai*-plant,' we have proof that the nom. and not the gen. is used in this construction, as with *mān*.

šarhiškit occurs only here. The meaning 'treat in the manner of a lion' is entered in Sturtevant, *HGL*, with the authority of Götze; but 'behave in the manner of a lion' would be more correct in view of the dative with *ANA* (the word is nearly obliterated, but the traces are unmistakable). Similar words are *šarhana-* (XXVII 69 II 3, 7, acc. *šar-ha-na-an*), *šarhul* or *šarhūla-* (dat.-loc. *šar-hu-u-li*, X 83 I 3, abl. *šar-hu-la-az*, XII 65 11), *šarhuyanza* (*HGL* 134, new refs.: XIII 4 I 13, XXVII 67 II 56), and *šar-hu-*, XXIV 7 III 25, 56, 66 (in immediate context an angry bull, great rivers, winds, cf. Sommer, *HAB* 76). But none of these is certainly connected with our verb.

D II 2-3. The restoration *URU Arinn[as] IŠTU DUTU*, to correspond to *IŠTU DUTU URU Arinna*, is supported by XXVIII 6 obv. 12b: *URUTÚL-na-as DUTU-uš*.

3. *arahzena* KUR-e. According to Sommer, *AU* 343¹, a survival of the old nom.-acc. pl. in *-a*, on account of the plural form in C. But C is not an exact duplicate here, and the form in *-a* may also be nom.-acc. sg.; for *-a-* stems, like *-i-* and *-u-* stems, sometimes show the bare stem in this case, instead of the form in *-an*: see Friedrich, *Vert.* I 78, Sommer, *AU* 164, and Götze, *Mél. Ped.* 489.

These lands must therefore be either the object of the verb *a-ar[-]* or the place to which a motion is directed; cf. Friedrich, *Vert.* II 40¹ (the acc. of route is out of the question). The only transitive verb written in this way is *ār-k-*, which is used exclusively in ritual texts, apart from two obscure passages in the Code where it appears to mean 'steal' (Götze, *NBr.* 58¹). Hence the verb can only be a part of *ar-* 'come' or of its dur.-distr. stem *aršk-*, and since it must be a 3 sg. pret. the only possible restorations are *a-ar[-as]* or *a-ar[-as/ši/ša-ki-ū]*.¹ In fact there can be no doubt that the dur.-distr. form is right, for C has such a form, and there are exact parallels for this use of *aršk-* in *Hatt.* II 13 and *KBo.* III 4 III 70. As regards the meaning, Sturtevant is surely right

1. Various spellings: *a-ar-ša-ki-iz-zi*, XIII 2 I 25 (same verb ?); *a-ar-ši-ki-ū*, IX 2 IV 5. But *a-ar-as-* is normal: e.g. *Hatt.* II 13, 2 *BoTU* 23 § 13, *KBo.* III 4 III 70, *KUB* XIII 2 III 5, XIX 39 II 10, *VBoT* 24 I 32.

(*Chrest.* 69) in translating 'made incursions' (but why from *artari* 'rise, start, stand,' *ibid.* 92 ?); Götze's 'arrived at, reached' ignores the dur.-distr. stem. The meaning is, however, independent of *parā*, which should be interpreted according to Zuntz, *Ortsadv.* 59 f., as an adverb 'further' in both these passages (so correct Sturtevant, *HGl.* 29).

C II 46. *parā*='further, moreover,' see Zuntz, *Ortsadv.* 59 f.

C II 46=D II 4. *ku-i-uš*. This acc. pl. is intelligible as a simple relative after both towns, as in C, but is most unnatural, if taken in this way, after each separately, as in D. Nor would this yield the correct sense, for Aleppo and Babylon are not specially concerned, but are taken as examples for the more general statement that follows. The translation given seems to be what the writer is trying—somewhat inadequately—to express.

The line refers of course to the great raid of Mursili I related in the Telipinu text (2 *BoTU* 23).

D II 5. *a-aš-šu-mi-it* is an error for *aššu-šmit*. The mistake somewhat resembles that discussed by Sommer, *AU* 158 f. (DAM-ZU for DAM-IA=-*uš-šmuš* for -*uš-muš*), but it cannot be explained as a dictation mistake, unless the *u* was very weakly pronounced. Haplography for *a-aš-šu-šu-mi-it* is technically ruled out by the fact that this possessive is written with *ša*, *še*, or *šum*, but never with *šu*, though no doubt the omission of the sign was due to the influence of the *šu*.

C II 49=D II 7. Cf. Sommer, *AU* 343. For the extended forms in -*anza* see Friedrich, *Vert.* I 85 f.; Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 171.

C II 50=D II 8. KUR.KUR.MEŠ, which is added in D (Bo. 3556), is difficult to explain. If taken with the preceding *humanteš*, it alters the construction of the sentence and is very awkward; and if taken with KUR URUKUBABBAR-*ti* it can only be regarded as a mistake, as the whole of this section depends on the distinction between the 'lands of Hatti' which have rebelled and the 'land of Hatti' proper which they are attacking.

yaḥhannēškiyan/yaḥhannīyan dāir. Götze, *Hatt.* 66 ff., distinguished carefully between forms from *dā- dai-* and *tiḫa-* in this construction. Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 161b, admitted only one construction, namely, that with *dai-*. In reply Götze, *MS* 21, has reiterated his distinction between *dā-* and *dai-*, but has conceded that *tiḫa-* must here be treated as a

secondary formation from *dai-*. However, Sturtevant, *Chrest.* 195 f., and Bechtel, *Hittite Verbs*, 67-9, have now pointed out that the only form of the paradigm used in this phrase which appears to come from *dā-* is *dāir*, and that this may equally well come from *dai-*. They also show that Götze has failed to prove a distinction on semantic or other grounds. There is therefore good reason to agree with them that only *dai-* is concerned here, in the sense 'begin to, set about.' Bechtel is inclined to admit *tīia-* also.

The *-sk-* form is almost invariably used in this phrase; see Götze, *Hatt.* 67, and Sommer, *HAB* 56. The occurrence of *yalhanniyan* here as a variant is a further instance showing the close relation of the form in *-nā-* to that in *-sk-* already noted by Götze, *Madd.* 129 f.

C II 53=D II 9. Bo. 3556 shows that the negative is really omitted in D; for this text does not leave a gap before the last word in order to finish at the end of the line, and we cannot therefore suppose that *li-e* stood at the end in the way noticed by Götze in *Madd.* 114. The sentence as it stands might indeed be taken as a question; but it is unlikely that this was intended on account of the negative in C, and because, as Sommer has pointed out in *AU* 95, rhetorical questions, such as this would be, have no connecting particle in Hittite, unless preceded by other questions or by a subordinate clause. In fact *tu-el-e* in the previous line indicates a certain lack of concentration on the part of the scribe at this point; but one wonders how often one may be justified in supplying a negative in a difficult passage!

tepšanuši (C) = *tepnuškiši* (D). *tepšanu-* should be the causative formed from the adj. *tepšu-*,¹ for which Götze (*Madd.* 72¹) deduced the meaning 'sterile,' and it is entered in Sturtevant's Glossary as 'make sterile, make powerless.' However, Ehelolf has now published in *MDOG* 75.67 a new text, which when compared with its duplicate shows the same variation as here between *tepš-* and *tep-*, namely:

531/f II 11: *tak-ku* DXXX SI ZAG-ŠU GAM KI-i *ne-ia-aš*!
 KUR-e-aš EBUR-aš *te-ip-ša-u-e-eš-zi*
 =VIII 6 II 11: *tak-ku* DXXX SI ZAG[]*-ia-an* KUR-*ia-aš*
 EBUR *te-pa-u-e-eš-zi*

1. *u-* and *i-* stem adjectives lose their stem-vowel before *-nu*: see Sommer, *AU* 55, and Götze, *AM* 253. Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 329, prefers to 'reckon with the possibility of derivation from verbs that are still unknown.'

Now a harvest can hardly be said to be 'sterile' or 'powerless,' and it is in fact clear from these two passages that *tepsu-* is a mere bye-form of *tepu-* 'small.'

This does not necessarily conflict with the other instances of the word. Certainly *te-ip-šu-uš* (sc. *ešzi*) in XVII 10 III 17 stands for *ha-aš-ša-tar-še-it* NUGÁL in *KBo.* VI 34 II 31. But the texts are not duplicates; in *KBo.* VI 34 the conclusion is 'so may the sacred oaths destroy that man's future,' whereas in XVII 10 it is 'so may the anger etc. of Telipinu be *tepsaues*.'¹ As regards *te-ip-ša-(u)-a-an-ni*, 2 *BoTU* 12A II 12 = C I 19, '(he died) in insignificance' actually seems more likely than 'in barrenness,' but the text is obscure, and there are no others.²

C II 54-55 // D II 10. *karpīš* and *kardimmiāz* are approximate synonyms and nearly always occur together. There must be some difference between them, but at present it cannot be determined. The former occurs very frequently in the KIN oracle, the latter never; but only the latter has the ideogram TUKU.TUKU. The spelling with *-di-*, *-dam-*, or *-dim-*³ (never with *-ti-*) strengthens the probability that *kardimmiāz* is in some way related to the word *kart/d-* 'heart': dat.-loc. *kar-di*, I 16 II 31, 63 (but *kar-ti-i*, XXVI 25 4); gen. *kar-di-aš*, *KBo.* III 7 I 26, *kar-di-ia-aš*, 2 *BoTU* 12A III 17 (*kar-ti-ia-aš*, IV 1 IV 20). Cf. Accad. *libbu* < *labābu* (Ehelolf).⁴

It is clear that in D these words are used in a pregnant way as = '(object of) anger'; for there is no word for 'and' or 'or,' and therefore *UL nahhanza*, which can only be applied to a person, must agree with them. There is no exact parallel to this usage; the nearest is XIV 8 obv. 37, where *kardimmiāz* is rightly translated by Götze (*KlF.* I 213) '(reason for) anger,' the subject being *me-mi-ia-aš* (33); similarly

1. Yet both have the words 'they bring it not to the field to make seed of it, nor do they make bread of it to put in the "seal-house",' whence Götze's inference was a very natural one.

2. This note had already been written when through the kindness of Professor Ehelolf I was able to see the proof-pages of Sommer-Falkenstein, *HAB.* Sommer, *ibid.* 141 fn. 4, has reached the same conclusion in even more certain terms. He is content to refer *tepsuš* in XVII 10 to the shrinking of the malt, and this is probably satisfactory.

3. Spelling of *kardimmiāz* (in various forms): with *-di-*, XVII 10 III 1, 11, 13, 16, 23, IV 3, 7, 8, 18; *Bo.* 2488 rev. 11, 12 (*KlF.* I 188); with *-dam-*, *KBo.* II 2 II 25, 44, III 22, 25: elsewhere always with *-dim-* (*tim*).

4. Another synonym is *šāyar* (partic. *šanza*=Accad. *zina*, *KBo.* I 42 II 34), see Götze, *NBr.* 80.

kattayātar in C II 31 (D I 20) = ' (occasion for) vengeance.'¹ However, in other respects the construction in D is normal. For *kūiš* in conditional clauses see Friedrich, *Vert.* I 87, and Sommer, *AU* 133.

In C the construction is not so clear, owing to the double *kūiš*. Since there is here no *mān*, the first *kūiš* is most naturally taken in the sense 'as regards,' for which see Sommer, *AU* 284; and as there is still no conjunction, *UL naḥḥanza* should, as in D, agree with *karpiš kardimmiāz*, which form a pair of the kind noted by Sommer, *ibid.* 157. The second *kūiš* is then left in the air. This could be avoided by taking the first *kūiš* with *karpiš* and the second with *kardimmiāz* (chiasmus); but such an order is hardly natural. Another possibility is to take *kūiš* . . . *kūiš* together as = Lat. *quisquis* 'whoever'; but again the order of the words is without analogy and most unnatural. It seems rather that by inserting an extra *kūiš* the writer has attempted to separate *karpiš kardimmiāz* from *UL naḥḥanza*, and so to avoid the pregnant use of those two words, with which he was unfamiliar. This would account for the awkwardness of the construction and would at the same time imply that D is the earlier of the two texts.

C II 55-59 = D II 11-13. The meaning of the interesting passage that follows must unfortunately remain in doubt unless and until a duplicate is found which preserves the verb in 59. The first sign of this verb can only be *ḥar/hur*; *ki* is possible in D but not in C. To judge from C the whole word contained at least five signs. Now the superficial resemblance to Abraham's prayer in Gen. 18.23 ff., striking though it is (note the opening ' wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked? '), must not be used as evidence to prove that the verb must mean 'spare'; for there are essentially two possible interpretations, either 'if he (=the wicked) be one city, one . . . , or one man, destroy him *alone*,' or 'if he (=the good) be one city (etc.), save him (though he be only) one.' If the first alternative is correct, the resemblance to the prayer of Abraham is obviously much more remote. Now it must be admitted that whereas a form of *ḥarnink-* 'destroy' will fill the space perfectly and would follow naturally after *ḥar-kán-zi* in 56, there appears

1. Sommer, *HAB* 50, quotes *kardimmiāz* in XIV 8 obv. 37 as an analogy for his interpretation of *kattayātar* as ' (object of) an avenging,' though in fact it is evidence against him and in favour of the interpretation given above. The present passage, which is the only real parallel to what Sommer takes to be the sense of *kattayātar*, is not mentioned by him.

to be no suitable verb meaning 'spare'; *har-kán-du* 'let them hold,' i.e. hold back, or keep in safety, might be considered, but it does not fill the space and would be misleading after *har-kán-zi*. The general sense of the context, however, demands the second rendering. For on the first alternative, which is a plea against overstepping the strict limits of justice, one does not see why this should be more likely to occur in the punishment of a single man than in that of a number of men, since it is assumed by implication that the gods have already marked down the offender; whereas on the second, a single just man is obviously in greater danger of being overlooked than several, in what is assumed to be a large-scale punishment. The offenders and their misdeeds have indeed been already described at some length in the previous paragraphs, and it is almost incredible that the writer should suggest that after all there may be only one wicked man.

Thus there are strong general arguments in favour of the second alternative, with its close resemblance to the prayer of Abraham, and it therefore seems advisable to leave the text unrestored, since the only available restoration has the wrong sense.

D II 13 ff. A close parallel is XX 92 VI 10 ff.:

nu-ut-ták-kán TI-tar La-ba-ar-na-aš LUGAL-aš a-aš-ši-ia-an e-eš-du
La-ba-ar-na-an-ma-kán TI-ni SIG₅-it IGI.ĜI.A-it an-da uš-ki

'And may the life of Labarna¹ the king be dear to thee,
 and look with auspicious glance upon Labarna for life.'

a-aš-ša-u-it has been inserted instead of SIG₅ in order to fill the space in D; C may have had SIG₅-it.² For the meaning 'conferring well-being, blessing' rather than 'kindly, merciful' see Sommer, *HAB* 46 f.

The last two signs of 15 on Bo. 3556 seem to be 'iš'-en, an impossible combination. The addition of *te* is almost inevitable, and is justified by the other mistakes in D noted above.

1. I.e. the reigning king, who has assumed the name of the founder of the dynasty as a surname. For a full examination of the evidence see now Sommer, *HAB* 20-9.

2. For SIG₅=*aššu*- see Sommer, *AU* 125¹; also SIG₅-*uš* apparently nom. in XV 5 I 22.

SECTION IV

(a)

(B II 3=) A III 19. *ḫaršallanta*. The meaning of *ḫaršallanza* is approximately established by the equation with Accad. *šabsu*, *KBo.* I 42 II 36, III 10-11. It occurs nowhere else.

B II 4=A III 19. *kyeš(-kán)*. The immediate abandonment of the neuter for the personal gender here is a good instance of the way in which the sense exercises a stronger influence than the strict grammar in the Hittite texts, for it is the inhabitants of the lands who rebel, not the lands themselves (cf. Sommer, *AU* 82).

ANA *DTelipini*. For Accadian prepositions before words with determinative see Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10 19.

The normal dative from *DTelipinu-*, *DTe-li-pi-nu-i*, is recorded in XVII 10 III 8, 9, IV 6. The present anomalous form cannot be accounted for by the influence of the Accadian preposition *ANA*, since it occurs without it in XVII 10 IV 2 and *Bab.* IV 224 rev. 5. Possibly it is to be explained as an instance of the reversion to the *a-* declension, a tendency to which Götze has drawn attention in *Mél. Ped.* 488 ff. A bye-form *DTe-li-pu-na-aš* is attested in XXV 23 IV 61 (parallel to *DḪa-ti-pu-na-an*, *ibid.* II 10).

A III 21. The error *kyedaš* for *kyeš* is inexplicable, unless it is due in some way to the influence of *šumenzan* (gen. pl.). It cannot be due to mishearing, and all the neighbouring lines have the nom.

For *-ma* in sequences see Ehelolf in *OLZ*, 1926, 770.

B II 9=A IV 5. *ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš-za*. So also in C III 4 and 6. Taken by itself this could be analysed satisfactorily as *kyeš-* (or *kue-*) *šmaš-za*=‘who from you’ (dat. of disadvantage). But it is perfectly clear from *ku-e-eš-kán*, *ku-i-e-eš-ma-aš*, and *ku-e-eš-ma* in B II 4, 5, and 6, that we have to reckon with *kueš-ma* in the present case. It would be possible in B II 9=A IV 5 to understand *kueš-ma-aš-za*=‘and who seek to take them (*-aš-*) from the ploughmen etc.’ (with omission of *ANA* before the ideograms); but this is obviously not the sense in C III 4, and there is no other possible interpretation of the pronoun *-aš-*. The

only remaining alternative is to assume haplography for *ku-i-e-eš* <*ma-aš*->*ma-aš-za*, i.e. *kueš-ma-šmaš-za*. This gives excellent sense, and though we should not normally expect to find the same mistake in three places and in essentially independent duplicates, this solution may be accepted without hesitation, since Friedrich in *OLZ* 39.309¹ has collected a number of instances (including this) which show that precisely this phenomenon is remarkably common.

B II 11=A IV 8. NAM.ḪI.A. Cf. VIII 1 III 3: *KUR-e an-da NAM a-ra-a-i* 'in the land NAM will arise.' Götze, *NBr.* 10¹, points out the correspondence with Accad. *tibūt aribi* 'flight of locusts,' but reads MUD for NAM; Sommer, *AU* 136², exposes this mistake, but translates 'Todesschicksal.' That 'locust' is correct is rendered very probable by the occurrence of NAMMUŠEN GUŠKIN in XVI 83 50, and Ehelolf has found evidence proving that NAM is the regular ideogram for 'locust' in the Hittite texts, corresponding to the sign NAM (or ḪU)+ERÍN (Deimel, *ŠL*, no. 79a).

This reference to locusts in A and B suggests that this prayer was not written at the same time as C (and D); but see introduction. C here substitutes an address to the Sun of Arinna and in the parallel passage II 33 adds *kurur* 'hostility.'

B II 11. pāi. The text as here printed contains an anacoluthon; for although the paragraph is addressed to Telipinu and the gods of Ḫatti, and plural pronouns are used throughout, the verb here, like those in the following paragraph, is singular. It is probably best to accept this, as it is a frequent phenomenon in Hittite. But it may be pointed out that all the plural elements are lost in B and all the verbs in A, so that there is a possibility that B was singular throughout (the gods being omitted) and that A had plural verbs.

B II 13=A IV 11. EGIR UD-MI. The omission of *ŠA* in both texts can hardly be a scribal error. It is analogous to that of *ANA* and *INA* which serve to indicate the dative as *ŠA* indicates the genitive.¹

B II 14=A IV 12. GIŠšeša(n)naš must be gen. either of an *-a*-stem **šeša(n)na-* or of an *r/n*-stem **šešatar*.² The word is ἄπαξ εἰρημένον,

1. See Friedrich, *Vert.* II 38 ff. Cf. Sommer, *HAB* 122¹.

2. Single *n* occasionally in oblique cases of *r/n*-stems: see Sommer, *AU* 94. Another tree with the ending *-tar* is now attested in *GIŠku-ya-i-tar*, *XXIX* 1 IV 7.

but a tree associated with corn and the vine in a prayer for plenty must be one of the most important products of the country. The probability is therefore strong that it is to be found elsewhere in the Bo. texts in the guise of an ideogram. It is tempting to compare *ZÍZ-tar* 'spelt, emmer' (see esp. *KBo.* IV 2 I 9, *KUB* XVII 10 I 14); however, *ZÍZ* is never written with the determinative *GIŠ*—as indeed one would expect, since it is a kind of wheat. This determinative indicates a tree, and we find the following trees written ideographically in the Hittite texts: *GIŠZERTUM* (see below), *GIŠMA* 'fig', *GIŠERIN* 'cedar', *GIŠHAŠHUR* 'apple (?)'¹ and *GIŠHAŠHUR KUR.RA* 'pomegranate (?)'.² But neither fig, cedar, nor pomegranate would be regarded as equal in importance to the vine, and the same applies to the apple, even though it appears to have been extensively cultivated.³ However, an identification with *GIŠZERTUM* seems to be not only possible but probable. This apparently Accadian word is mentioned frequently as a tree (*VII* 39 9, 11; *IX* 22 II 8, 22; *XVII* 10 II 19) and as a fruit, often with *GIŠMA* 'fig' (*XII* 26 III 12, *XV* 34 I 16, *XVII* 28 III 34, *XXV* 42 III 10); but it is also the regular source of vegetable oil (*KBo.* V 2 I 12, II 8, 38; *KBo.* II 3 II 38, etc.). Hence its association with the corn and vine here would give a striking parallel to the 'corn, wine and oil' of Hosea II 8.⁴ Now *GIŠZERTUM* is almost certainly to be identified with Accad. *sirdu*, which is also a source of oil; and Hrozný, who suggested the identification in *BoSt.* III 71¹⁰, followed Meissner, *Assyriologische Studien*, V 19, in deducing from this fact that this tree is the olive. Yet this is by no means certain, and Dr. R. C. Thompson will in a forthcoming work bring reasons for identifying *sirdu* with the Syriac ܐܝܬܐ 'bitter almond'; see provisionally *JRAS*, 1937, 266⁴.

Thus the translation 'almond' rests upon a chain of three unproved hypotheses, namely, *GIŠšeša(n)naš* (*šešatar* ?) = *GIŠZERTUM* = *GIŠserdu* = ܐܝܬܐ. But it is at least as probable as any other.

B II 15. *gimraš luitnit.* The instrumental case is here apparently

1. Deimel, *ŠL*, no. 146, considers this a kind of palm, on account of the early form of the sign MA and because its fruit is in one text called KALUM 'date.' This seems to be refuted by its occurrence in the Bo. texts (Asia Minor). Hommel's identification with Aramaic ܡܢܝܐ is surely correct.

2. VII 44 obv. 13; XXVIII 8 obv. 2b.

3. Cf. Götze, *Kultur*, III.

4. On the other hand, Deut. VIII 8 may be held to support an identification with the fig or the pomegranate (or apple).

used in a comitative sense='together with.' I do not know of any exact parallel to this, but cf. II 5 V 2 f. *ta LÚQA.ŠU.DU₈.A GAL KUBABBAR GEŠTIN-it LUGAL-i pa-a-i* 'the cup-bearer hands a bowl with wine to the king' (possibly the scribe has omitted a word for 'filled' by mistake). Sommer, *HAB* 177², considers the possibility of a mistake for dat.-loc.¹ This, however, would involve taking all the preceding words in *-aš* as dat.-loc. also, whereas a comparison with A III 11 ff. shows the interpretation as gen. to be more probable.

B II 16=A IV 15. *mieš(ša)du*. It seems that we have to distinguish between two very similar verbs:

(i) *miēš-* 'be soft, gentle,' denominative from the adj. *miu-* 'soft, smooth, pleasant,'; established by XVII 10 II 26 f. (quoted by Ehelolf, *OLZ*, 1933, 3) and Bo. 681 4 f.+Bo. 5810 obv. 4 ff. (*ibid.* fn. 2), where *mi-i-e-eš-tu/du* corresponds to a preceding form of *miu-*. Also imp. *mi-i-e-eš*, *VBoT* 24 III 38, which Sturtevant, *Chrest.* 115, rightly translates 'become gentle.' The form is somewhat irregular, for on the analogy of *italaēš-* and *tepaēš-* we should expect **miāēš-* from this *-u-* stem adjective; though in the same passage (XVII 10 II 27) we have *mīlīteš-* from *milittu-*.

(ii) *meš-*, an extended form of *mai-* 'be ripe, abundant, thrive,' like *peš-* 'give' from *pai*; attested in XVI 76 11 [*ma-a*]-*an ki-e-da-ni MU-ti ḫal-ki-uš mi-eš-ša[-an-zi ?]* 'if in this year the crops will thrive,' for which we may compare XVII 28 II 47 *ḫal-ki-iš li-e ma-a-i* and *ibid.* III 3 *ḫal-ki-iš ma-a-ú*.

It will be seen that no. i, for which we have three passages, is consistently written *mi-i-e-eš-*, whereas no. ii in the only passage available has the spelling *mi-eš-*. The present text has an intermediate spelling *mi-e-eš-*, and the proximity of *mišātar* suggests that this represents an alternative writing of no. ii, for which a single text is insufficient to establish a rule. The subject would then be the crops, cattle, etc., just enumerated. On a closer consideration, however, this verb seems rather to belong to the following clause, the subject being either *hemuš* (see foll. note) or some word which is broken off. See especially text A, where lines 15-18 each seem to contain a single sentence beginning with *nu*; otherwise there would be a new sentence connected only by the

1. A clear case of superfluous *-it* is *ḫa-a-li-it* in XII 58 IV 9.

enclitic *-a* (in *he-mu-uš-ša*) which is rare.¹ If this is so, the verb *mi-e-eš-ša-du* should probably be taken from no. i (denominative from *miu-*), for Götze, *NBr.* 32¹, states that the adj. *miu-* is actually used of rain in Bo. 706 rev. 21, 27. This raises the question whether *miuš* and *mai-* are not fundamentally cognate, as assumed by Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 105, for the context here requires not 'may rain be gentle' but 'may rain be rich, abundant,' a meaning not far removed from that elsewhere attested for *mai-*. The question could perhaps be decided by an examination of the context in Bo. 706.

The form *mi-e-eš-ša-du* should be 3 pl. with elision of the *n*, a common phenomenon especially before *t*: see Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 57, where older literature is cited, and cf. *hu-u-ya-du-uš* in the foll. line. The singular form *mi-e-eš-du* in A is difficult to explain, unless *hemuš* is gen. (see following note) and the subject is lost; for *hemuš* can hardly be nom. sg., and if the verb is taken with the preceding sentence, the subject is certainly plural. The possibility that *meššadu* has undergone a further contraction and so become identical with the singular form is not very likely, especially since the *n* was probably never quite lost in pronunciation.²

B II 17=A IV 16. *hēmūšša(?)*. If the reading is correct (the *-e* is particularly doubtful), this should be the nom. or acc. pl. of *heu-* 'rain,' *mu* being used for *yu* as in *italamuš* (XXIV 9 II 42) and *pargamuš* (Friedrich, *ZA.* NF. II 278 f.); *he-mu-uš* is actually attested in Bo. 1078 obv. (?) 14 (*ap.* Friedrich, *Vert.* II 166) as acc. pl. But it may also be gen. sing. (see above on A II 5=C I 18). The syntax is uncertain, owing to the loss of the following word in both texts; cf. previous note.

B II 17=A IV 17. *ši/eššayaš* for *šešduyaš* in both texts suggests an error in dictation (perhaps due to confusion with *šešuyar* 'sleeping'), and that would imply that these two texts were dictated together. They are in any case duplicates throughout except for the colophon, which is lacking in B. On *šešd-* see Götze, *KlF.* I 240 f.

A IV 17. Sommer, *HAB* 156², is surely right in regarding *INA* here as mistakenly inserted by the scribe. A subject is required for

1. See Sommer, *AU* 212, and above on C II 44.

2. See Sommer in *KlF.* I 349, and Sturtevant, *loc. cit.*

māu šešdu, and the explanation that the scribe has understood *utne* as dat.-loc. instead of nom. both here and in C II 35 is satisfactory.

B II 18 f.=A IV 18. *pankuš*, originally an adj.=‘total, general’ (Götze, *AM* 239 f.), acquired a substantival sense=‘the totality, assembled multitude, οἱ πολλοί,’ translated into Accadian by *nagbatu*, an abstract subst. formed *ad hoc* from *nagbu* ‘crowd’: see Sommer, *HAB* 29 f., and for the sociological implications of the *p.* in the early kingdom, *ibid.* 186, 211. In ritual texts it is the regular word for ‘the congregation,’ as here; cf. *HT* 39 rev. 4, *KUB* XII 8 II 11, III 4; XXIII 76 8 (?); XXV 36 II 10, 14, 37 II 21, 38 5, 8, 11.

apāt eštu ‘amen,’ also *KBo.* VI 34 I 40, II 4, etc. (Friedrich, *ZA.* NF. I 162 ff.), and apparently 2 *BoTU* 8 III 54: see Sommer, *HAB* 177.

(b)

C III 5. *tannataruyanzi* for *tanna(t)taḥḫuyanzi*. There is general agreement that the Hittite suffix *-aḥ-* represents the IE denominative *-ā-* (Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 346; Couvreur, *Hett.* ḫ 17; Kurylowicz, *Études Indoeuropéennes*, 73); and Couvreur and Kurylowicz have shown that the Hittite ḫ stands for several gutturals which were lost in all other IE languages. We might therefore expect to find that these sounds had already begun to disappear in Hittite. But as Sturtevant points out in *HGr.* § 62, ‘Hittite ḫ is as stable as any sound in the language.’ The present instance of the loss of ḫ was indeed unknown to Sturtevant, and is particularly striking on account of the intervocalic position of the ḫ—it might therefore have been quoted with advantage by Götze, *MS* 31 f., who tries to establish a case for the weakness of ḫ in Hittite. Other instances, however, are remarkably few. The closest parallel is *i-da-la-ya-at-ti* for *i-da-la-ya-aḥ-ti* in *KBo.* V 13 IV 5; but this is almost certainly a blunder, as shown by Sturtevant, *HGr.*, p. 72 fn. 72. Apart from this we have only the case of *ešḫar* > *ēššar* (Ehelolf, *OLZ*, 1927, 29) quoted by Friedrich in *KlF.* I 92¹ and Götze, *loc. cit.*; and this also can be explained away, with Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 145, as an analogical creation on the basis of the common abstract nouns in *-šar*. Götze also cites the words *uḫate-* and *peḫute-* as showing the loss of ḫ, but this seems most questionable. Thus in view of the rarity—one may even say the non-existence—of the phenomenon in other Hittite texts it is probably better to regard the present instance also as a mistake; though if it

is a dictation mistake, it is at least evidence that the sound was not strongly audible.

C III 12. The sign after DUTU URU *Arinna* seems to be *ia*, which could only be translated 'also' following *nu*; but 'also' is not required here, and the sign must be regarded as doubtful.

C III 13. *mukeškiḫhu*[t]. This seems to be the only possible restoration of this word. A passive is possible, since *mugar-* is transitive (see above, p. 49 f.). A stem **mukeškiā-* (reading *-ah-* for *-ih-*) would be contrary to all analogy, since *šešk-* in *še-eš-ki-ia-ah-ḫu-ut* (2 *BoTU* 4A rev. 9) is not a dur.-distr. stem.¹

C III 43. *šarā kittari*. *šarā ki-* is the passive of *šarā dai-*,² which is regularly used for the 'setting up' of meat, bread, beer and wine (Sturtevant, *JAOS* LIV 399).

COLOPHONS

A IV 19. *DUP-I-PU* occurs also II 9 VI 3, X 27 VI 1, XXV 14 VI 1 and XXVI 1 IV 54 for the normal DUP I KAM; but, though the signs 'kam' and 'pu' are very similar, there is no evidence apart from this phrase that the Hittites ever confused them, nor would such a confusion be likely to occur five times in a single phrase. It is also impossible to take *-PU* as in any sense a complement to I, for the scribes were familiar with the Accadian word for 'first' *maḫru*, which does not end in *-B/PU*. There cannot therefore be any question that the numeral is here actually inserted between the two parts of the word *DUPPU*. Why this should have been done is a mystery. In I *DUP-PU* (XXV 23 IV 60) and III *DUP* (*Taw.*, col. IV) the numeral is certainly ordinal, as pointed out by Sommer, *KlF.* I 337 and *AU* 190 (against Forrer, *Forsch.* I 97). But it is perhaps significant that the present order is found only with the numeral I, and that in the colophon of *Madd.* the scribe evidently felt that DUP I KAM was not enough and added the Accadian *MA-AḪ-RU-Ū*. Both these facts suggest that in some way—presumably in pronunciation—DUP I KAM and *DUP-I-PU* were identical with *DUPPU* alone; that in fact the numeral I was purely graphic. One might suppose that *DUP-I-PU* was used where the whole

1. See Bechtel, *Hittite Verbs*, 15 f.

2. See Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10.52.

work consisted of one tablet only (certainly text A seems to be complete here). But II 9 belongs to a series—describing the *nuntariiašhaš* festival—of which we have the second tablet (XX 70) and possibly the fifth (XXV 12).

C IV 1-8. For *arḥaḥian* (8) Sommer and Ehelolf in *BoSt.* 10 17 f. suggested the meaning 'previously, in advance.' Sturtevant's *HGL* quoting Götze gives 'what follows, sequel, addition'; as adv. 'additionally, separately,' on the evidence of the present passage. We now have an exceptionally clear piece of evidence in XXIX 4 III 33: *na-at ar-ḥa-ia-an kat-ta ti-an-zi Ū-UL-at IT-TI DINGIR-LIM ti-an-zi* 'they put it down *arḥaḥian*; they do not put it by the god,' where the second clause is marked as explanatory by the asyndesis, and the meaning can therefore only be 'at a distance, apart.' Another good example is XXIV 8 IV 13 ff.:

- 13 [PUT]U-uš-za URUZIMBIR-an e-eš[-zi]
- 14 [P]XXX-aš-ma-za URUKu-zi-na-an e-eš[-zi]
- 15 [P]X-aš-za URUKum-mi-ia-an e-eš[-zi]
- 16 [P]INNINNI-iš-ma-za URUNe-nu-ya-an e-eš[-zi]
- 17 [P]Na-na-ia-aš-ma-za URUKi-iš-ši-na-a[n e-eš-zi]
- 18 [UR]UKÁ.DINGIR.RA-an-ma-za DAMAR.UTU-aš e[-eš-zi]
- 19 nu DINGIR.MEŠ GIM-an ar-ḥa-ia-an a-š[a-an-ta-ri]
- 20 ú-e-ša-za QA-TAM-MA ar-ḥa-ia[a-an e-šu-ya-aš-ta-ti]¹

The Sun-god dwells in Sippar,
 the Moon-god dwells in Kuzina,
 the Weather-god dwells in Kummiya,²
 'Ištar' dwells in Nineveh,
 Nanaia dwells in Kissina,
 and in Babylon Marduk dwells;
 and as the gods dwell apart,
 so let us also dwell apart.

This spatial sense is also attested in VII 14 I 7,³ XVI 5 rev. 9 (?) 77 III 55 (?), XXI 27 III 42, XXIV 11 III 18, XXV 37 IV 27.⁴ It is in accordance with the etymology of the word, derived as it is from

1. Cf. IV 6.

2. See Forrer, *JA*, 1930, 237-8, and *Mél. Cum.* 700.

3. Supply [*ti-ia-an-zi*] or some such word.

4. Not 'previously' here, since that would be *ka-ru-ú*.

arḥa- 'edge, boundary,'¹ and is therefore probably original. In the passages cited in *BoSt.* 10.17, and probably also in the present instance, there is abstraction from the spatial element, and the correct rendering is Götze's 'additionally, separately.' There does not seem to be any reason to suppose the existence of a substantival usage.²

I cannot restore the first two lines; but the sense is clearly that the scribe has entered on C 'the words of [some other] tablet' for the purpose of supplicating the Sun-goddess. These words may very well be the same as the *magaṣar*, of which, according to lines 7-8, there was a separate tablet. That C is a composite text has already been inferred from other evidence (see introduction and note on C II 54 f. // D II 10); it is composed of a prayer which is an approximate duplicate of A+B, and a plague-prayer which is an exact duplicate of D and 2156/g. We might well suppose that the text of D has been copied on to C; but it is only to A+B that the term *magaṣar* is applicable (see above, pp. 45 ff.), and this is sufficiently different to show that the prayer on C has not been copied from it, especially in Section IV. This difficulty cannot at present be solved. Either the colophon must be interpreted in a different way, or yet another tablet has still to be found which contains the *magaṣar* used as the basis for text C.

D II 23.]*zu-u-ū*[a. This line perhaps contained the name of the scribe: cf. *e.g.* II 13 VI 35 ff.; VII 1 IV 15; 25 rev. 8; IX 6 IV 27; X 18 VI 19; 89 VI 3; XIII 11 rev. 2; 9 IV 10; XV 31 IV 41; XX 8 VI 7. It must be noted, however, that the title and the signature are nowhere else separated by a line. A man ¹*Zu-ū-a* is mentioned as EN GIŠ.KIN.TI³ in XIII 9 IV 11; and a ¹*Zu-ū-a-an-ni* is grandfather of a scribe in X 96 3. The exact position of the former is not clear, because the colophon in which he occurs is badly broken. But the latter may well have been a scribe himself, as the profession often remained in the family. *E.g.* Pikku is scribe of VII 53 and X 18, and grandfather of the scribe of XV 31. Similarly at Nuzi a very large number of tablets were inscribed by Tāja, son of Apil-Sin; but his son Sin-nadin-šumi was also a scribe (nos. 9, 155, 207, 256, 261, 307, 310, 448, 471), and even his grandson Šel(-)aḫi-Tešup (nos. 103, 492).

1. See Forrer, *MAG* IV 33, and Sommer, *OLZ* XLII 164.

2. Cf. also XXII 10 I 6, 70 rev. 2, XXV 48 III 19, XXVIII 4 rev. 15.

3. Deimel, *SL*, no. 296 150. Cf. Sommer, *HAB* 126^a.

EXCURSUS

DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ - and DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{a}l\bar{l}i$ -

Götze in *KlF.* I 200 cites 'TÜK $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ ' as possibly a further instance of the adjective $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ - 'ordinary, regular' which he finds in 'NINDA $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ -' Sommer-Ehelolf, *BoSt.* 10 64, also consider the possibility of this combination.

Now the most cursory examination shows that DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ (not DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$, in view of DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{k}an$, *KBo.* II 7 I 23, II 16, etc.) has a different declension from NINDA $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ -, for the genitive is regularly DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{-(ja)-a\bar{s}}$ (not $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{a}i\bar{a}s$).¹ The other cases present certain difficulties. We have indeed one perfectly clear instance of an acc. DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{-in}$, XI 21a I 10. But the only other form attested is DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$, and this also seems to function as acc. with the verbs $\bar{s}u\bar{h}ha$ -, $\bar{h}e\bar{s}$ - and $\bar{g}enu$ - (see below). In phrases such as (IV) PA ZÍZ (II) PA GEŠTIN DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ ² the word may perhaps be taken as dative ('in a $\bar{h}$ -vessel'?), but this interpretation is impossible in the phrases with $\bar{s}u\bar{h}ha$ -, $\bar{h}e\bar{s}$ - and $\bar{g}enu$ -, unless we are to suppose that in all these very numerous passages the direct object is suppressed. Now in *VBoT* 3 VI 8: *IŠ-TU II* $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ GIM-an QA-TAM-MA *la-a-hu-u-ya-an-zi*, $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ is (pseudo?)-Accadian, and this possibility must also be considered in the phrases with ZÍZ and GEŠTIN already mentioned, where the preceding ideograms might account for a pseudo-Accadian form. Even so, however, it is impossible to explain away the acc. DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ with $\bar{s}u\bar{h}ha$ -, $\bar{h}e\bar{s}$ - and $\bar{g}enu$ -—unless indeed DUG $\bar{H}AR\bar{S}I$ is a genuine Accadian word, adopted into the Hittite declension after the manner of *tuppi*.³ This hypothesis would explain much of the evidence. But unfortunately no such Accadian word is known; for the 'stone vessel' $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}u$ entered by both Muss-Arnolt and Bezold is now known to be the Sumerian NA⁴ $\bar{H}AR.\bar{S}U$,⁴ which is some kind of mill-stone. The conclusion is therefore almost inevitable that DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i$ is a neuter subst., and that DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{-in}$ in XI 21a I 10 is a mistake, or an analogical formation.

1. Always in the phrase NINDA.KUR₄.RA DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{-(ja)-a\bar{s}}$, *KBo.* II 7 I 11, II 7, 19, 21, 13 I 11 ff., etc.; once without the determinative N. K. R. $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{-ja-a\bar{s}}$, XXV 23 I 18. For the explanation of this expression see below. Also É ŠA DUG $\bar{h}ar\bar{s}i\bar{-ja-a\bar{s}}$, *KBo.* II 13 obv. 24.

2. *KBo.* II 1 IV 13, etc., and with different numerals, *KUB* VII 24 I 5; ZÍZ only, *KBo.* II 7 I 18 f., *KUB* XVII 35 II 8.

3. Friedrich, *Vert.* II 139^a.

4. VAT. 10261 II 15 f. (Matouš, *Gegenstandslisten*, no. 86).

Thus DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i is not simply the same word as NINDA $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-, a conclusion which is supported by the fact that *DUG.KUR $_4$.RA does not occur. An examination of the evidence has shown that DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i—and the equivalent or very closely related DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli, which takes its place in certain texts¹—are mainly associated with a very definite context,² which may be outlined as follows: (1) In the season *zena*- ‘autumn’³ there is a ceremony of the ‘sprinkling’ (*šuh $\bar{h}$ a*-) of DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i⁴ or the ‘throwing, pouring’ (*iš $\bar{h}$ u $\bar{y}$ a*-) of DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli⁵; this is merely preliminary⁶ to (2) the ‘opening’ (*heš*- or *gēnu*-) of DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i or DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli,⁷ a festival which takes place in the seasons *hameš $\bar{h}$ a*- ‘spring’⁸ or *teš $\bar{s}$ i*,⁹ when it thunders.¹⁰ What exactly is meant by these terms is not entirely clear. No. 1 consists generally of sacrifices and feasting¹¹; no. 2 involves the ‘grinding’ (*malla*-) and ‘crushing’ (*harra*-) of the contents of the vessel,¹² usually ZIZ ‘emmer-wheat,’ and the making of this into

1. *Hatt.* IV 73, *KUB* VII 24 obv. 6 ff., XII 2 II 5, IV 1-7, XV 11 II 8-11, XXI 17 III 9 ff., XXV 23 I 1-33, 34-50, XXVII 15 IV 5-10. Götze, *KlF.* I 200, writes (wrongly) *haršijalaš*.

2. Complete texts: *KBo.* II 7 obv. 6-17, 20-30, rev. 1-9, 10-23 (= *KBo.* II 13 obv. 1-20); *KUB* XVII 35 II 9-32, XXV 23 I 1-33, 34-50, IV 47-59. Fragmentary, but recognisable as parts of similar descriptions: *KBo.* II 7 rev. 24-end (= *KBo.* II 13 obv. 21-end), *KBo.* II 13 rev. 2-9, *KUB* VII 24 obv. 6-end (almost complete), XIII 32 obv., XVII 35 I 1-16, IV 1-40 (different account of part 1), 37 I 1-15, IV 1-15, XXV 23 IV 4-10 and 11-22, XXVII 15 IV 5-10, *VBoT* 26 1-4, 5-end, *VBoT* 37, *VBoT* 122. Brief references to the festivals here described in V 7 obv. 12, XII 2 II 5-6, IV 1-7, XV 11 II 8-11, XVII 35 II 2-3. A rather different account of part 2 is given in XXI 17 III 9 ff.

3. *KBo.* II 7 obv. 6, 20, rev. 1, 12, *KBo.* II 13 obv. 25; *KUB* VII 24 obv. 6; XII 2 IV 2; XVII 35 II 34, IV 1; 37 I 18; *VBoT* 122 4.

4. *KBo.* II 7 obv. 6, 20; 13 obv. 3, 25; *KUB* XVII 35 II 2, 9, 10, IV 1; XXV 23 I 37, IV 50; *VBoT* 26 8.

5. *Hatt.* IV 73; *KUB* V 7 obv. 12; VII 24 obv. 6; XII 2 II 5-6, IV 1-3; XV 11 II 8-9; XXV 23 I 35-6. The apparently rigid association of *šuh $\bar{h}$ a*- with *har $\bar{s}$ i* and *iš $\bar{h}$ u $\bar{y}$ a*- with *haršijalli* is perhaps illusory, however, since there is one instance of DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i *iš $\bar{h}$ u $\bar{y}$ a*-, *KBo.* II 7 rev. 28. XXV 23 I 35-6 has the variant I PA ZIZ DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lliaš *iš $\bar{h}$ u $\bar{y}$ anzi*, which shows that the name of the vessel stands for its contents elsewhere, as indeed we should expect.

6. This follows from the fact that it is often referred to quite shortly, even where a full description of no. 2 is given: see esp. the passages from XXV 23. In XXI 17 III 2 ff. the place of no. 1 is taken by the words ‘I have placed a *haršijalli* of corn and a *haršijalli* of wine in Samu $\bar{h}$ a.’

7. Mentioned in all texts where the line in question is preserved. For XI 21 V 17 see below.

8. *KBo.* II 7 rev. 4, 16; *KUB* VII 24 I 11; XIII 32 obv. 7; XXV 23 I 8, 38.

9. *KBo.* II 7 I 9; *KUB* XVII 35 II 3, 12, 34, IV 39; XXV 23 IV 51; *VBoT* 26 9.

10. These are the only seasons when it thunders. Friedrich, *ZA.* NF. III 196, includes *zena*- on the basis of XII 2 IV 2-3; but in the light of the present evidence it is clear that line 3 belongs to a different season from line 2. Thunder is explicitly mentioned in *KBo.* II 7 I 9, II 16; *KUB* V 7 obv. 12; XII 2 IV 3; XIII 32 obv. 7; XVII 35 II 12; 37 IV 8; XXV 23 I 9, 39, IV 52; *VBoT* 26 11; 122 9.

11. Sacrifices, *passim*. Feasting, VII 24 obv. 9. XVII 35 IV 3-15 is a totally different account of no. 1.

12. *KBo.* II 7 I 10, 24, II 18; 13 I 10; *KUB* VII 24 I 11; XVII 35 II 15, I 4; 37 I 7; XXV 23 I 39, IV 52; *VBoT* 26 11.

NINDA.KUR₄.RA,¹ with which 'in the morning' (*lukatta/i*) a lengthy ritual is performed.² The details of this final ritual vary greatly in the different texts; but since they throw no further light on DUG_{har}ši we are not concerned with them here.

The phrases already mentioned such as IV PA ZÍZ II PA GEŠTIN DUG_{har}-ši (DUG_{har}-ŠI?) occur regularly in the lines preceding the descriptions of these ceremonies, and serve to specify the number of measures of spelt or wine to be provided for them. Therefore KBo. II 1, in which these phrases are frequent, belongs in this respect to the same context.

Outside this category of texts there are only two occurrences of DUG_{har}ši known to me, namely, the very obscure VBoT 3 VI 8 f. (on which see above, p. 120), and XI 21a I 8 ff.: GAL ME-ŠE-DI tar-kum-mi-ja-iz-z[i] (9) A-NA LÚALAN.KA×UD [><] (10) DUG_{har}-ši-in GEŠTIN pi-a[n-zí], which, as pointed out above, contains an irregular masc. accusative.³

DUG_{har}ši_{galli}, however, is found in somewhat different contexts. Three such vessels containing respectively oil, honey and fruit are presented to the god Kurwasu⁴ as an act of piety in XV 1 III 15; similarly one of corn and one of wine are presented to Ištar (?)⁵ of Samuša in XXI 17 II 12 f., III 3 f., and a silver one in XV 6 I 19. In *Hatt.* IV 73 and XV 11 II 8-9 the act of piety actually consists in the 'pouring' of the DUG_{har}ši_{galli} (part 1 of the ceremony described above) and in XV 11 II 10-11 the 'opening' (part 2) is also mentioned; but here the reference cannot be to the seasonal *har*ši- festivals. For although it might be thought that the occasion of the vow in XV 11—the deliverance of the earth from a drought (?)⁶—pointed in this direction, there is no such reference in *Hatt.* IV 73; and VII 5 IV 12 ff., where the language used bears a strong resemblance to that in *Hatt.*

1. Explicitly only XXVII 15 IV 10: DUG_{har}-ši-ja-al-la-aš ZÍZ NINDA.KUR₄.RA DÜ-an-zi. Elsewhere by implication, since the following ritual is concerned with NINDA.KUR₄.RA DUG_{har}ši_g.

2. The EZEN *ip-pi-ja-aš* of XII 2 IV 4 is apparently the technical name for this ritual; cf. *ip-pi-ja-an*, XVII 35 I 8, II 21, IV 28, and *ip-pi-ja*, KBo. II 13 obv. 15, also GIŠ_{ip-pi-ja-aš}, II 13 II 21, in a different context.

3. The parallel texts XXV 6 V 12, 17 VI 7 have DUG_{huppar} instead of DUG_{har}šin.

4. See lines 7-8, and cf. XVII 20 II 4.

5. Written DLIS throughout this text.

6. See II. 5-7: 'Whereas, O Goddess, my Lady, the [dark ?] earth is a-ra-a-an, and the corn is "bound," [if ?], my Lady, thou loosest the dark earth, and the corn recovers,' etc. The word *arān* I can only understand as = *ān* 'hot,' on the analogy of NINDA *arantit*, X 89 I 21 (Götze-Pedersen, *MS* 31).

IV 73 (even down to the strange use of the acc. *-an-*), is part of an incantation against sexual impotence,¹ and therefore entirely independent of seasonal implications. The 'opening' of the DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{i}$ alli occurs also in XI 21 V 17: (16) GAL LÚ.MEŠ.GEŠTIN (17) [DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{i}$ a-a][$\bar{l}$ - $\bar{l}$ i]² *ki-nu-uz-zi* (18) [GAL DUMU.MEŠ.É.GA]L³ GAL KUBABBAR LUGAL-i *pa-a-i* (19) [LUGAL-uš (?) GEŠT]IN *ša-ra-a III-ŠU hu-it-ti-ia-zi* (20) [*kat-ta-ia-at*] III-ŠU *la-hu-u-ya-i* 'The chief of the wine-men opens the $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{i}$ alli-vessel; [the chief of the palace-serv]ants gives a silver bowl to the king; [the king (?)] draws up wine three times, [and] pours [it down] three times.' There is no indication that this text has anything to do with the $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-festival outlined above. The same may be said of the very similar passage X 11 V 1 ff.: IŠ-TU GAL KUBABBAR (2) DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{i}$ a-al-la-az GEŠTIN (3) *ša-ra-a III-ŠU kar-ap-zi* (4) *kat-ta-ia III-ŠU la-a-hu-i* 'He raises up wine three times from the $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{i}$ alli-vessel with a silver bowl, and pours it down three times.' This text, however, provides us with the additional information that this piece of ritual takes place in the DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{i}$ a-al- $\bar{l}$ i- $\bar{i}$ a-aš É ŠĀ into which the king goes at line 25 of the preceding column (on the assumption that not many lines are lost at the end of that column); and this room is evidently equivalent to the É ŠĀ DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{i}$ a-aš of KBo. II 13 obv. 24. Finally XXV 18 III 35 must be mentioned, where DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{i}$ a- $\bar{l}$ i is inserted in the list of parts of the temple to which libations are to be poured—the order is $\bar{h}$ aš $\bar{s}$ i, KUŠkur $\bar{s}$ i, GIŠDAG-ti, GIŠAB- $\bar{i}$ a, D $\bar{H}$ ašamili $\bar{i}$ aš GIŠ-i, TUL-i, DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{i}$ ali, GIŠ $\bar{h}$ attalyaš GIŠ-i, and again $\bar{h}$ aš $\bar{s}$ i. The following passages are hopelessly mutilated: VII 12 obv. 4, X 83 VI 6, XVI 48 obv. 17, XXV 26 II 15, III 11; VBoT 10 6.

What conclusions can now be drawn from this evidence? The emphasis on thunder (the festival of the 'opening' is actually entitled EZEN *tet $\bar{h}$ ešnaš* in V 7 obv. 12) and the fact that in XXV 23 IV 38-46 (a mutilated paragraph of a text, other parts of which contain some of the fullest descriptions of the $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-festivals) we find a DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i and a DUGPUR-ZI-TUM $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i associated with DU $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i, might suggest that DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i (and therefore DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{i}$ alli) are connected with $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i 'thunder-storm (?),' rather than with NINDA $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-.

1. VII 5 and VII 8 are parts of the same tablet as IX 27, translated by Friedrich, AO XXV 2 16. See above, p. 48.

2. Restore from line 9.

3. Restore this and the following line from 21 ff.

It is indeed remarkable that DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i often seems to be specially associated with the Weather-god, e.g. KBo. II 7 obv. 18 f. But in the light of fuller evidence it is clear that DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli at least, and apparently DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i also, are associated with other deities and other contexts. Hence the connexion with $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i is probably non-existent, in spite of the presence of DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i in XXV 23. We must therefore ignore the seasonal character of the $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-festival and concentrate on the points which all these texts have in common. And we may say with some certainty that DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli is a large storage vessel, situated in a special part of the temple; it can be opened (and therefore closed), and may contain oil, honey, fruit, corn or wine, i.e. almost any form of food or drink. DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i is apparently equivalent to it.

What, then, is the relation of these vessels, if any, to NINDA $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-? The main evidence for a connexion seems to lie in the formation of the word $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli. For the suffix - $\bar{a}$ lli, to judge from the words $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ an $\bar{a}$ lli, i $\bar{s}$ u $\bar{y}$ an $\bar{a}$ lli, kuttan $\bar{a}$ lli, and pa $\bar{h}$ hu($\bar{u}$ e)n $\bar{a}$ lli, is used to denote an adornment or other appurtenance of the thing to which it is added.¹ Thus it would be contrary to all analogy that a given noun and a derivative in - $\bar{a}$ lli should be synonymous; from which it follows that DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli cannot be formed from DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i. It must therefore be formed from NINDA $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-, and it will then denote 'a vessel for (=containing?) NINDA $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i-.' This seems to conflict with what we have learnt of the contents of DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli; but perhaps it may be explained by the fact that the ritual of the opening of the DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli leads up to the making of NINDA.KUR $\bar{a}$.RA.²

How, then, can we account for DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i? Only on the assumption that it is a kind of abbreviation for DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i $\bar{a}$ lli, perhaps arising out of a pseudo-Accadian form, which later acquired a Hittite declension. The nearest analogy for such a procedure is that of *tuppi* already cited, but this was originally an Accadian not a Hittite word. Such a hypothesis would, however, explain the anomalous declension of the word already described, namely, acc. DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i beside DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i-in, gen. DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i³ beside DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{a}$ -a $\bar{s}$.⁴

1. See Sturtevant, *HGr.* § 173, and *Lang.* X 267 f.

2. What is the meaning of DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i TA NINDA.KUR $\bar{a}$.RA $\bar{s}$ uh $\bar{h}$ an $\bar{z}$ i, XVII 35 II 10, and DUG $\bar{h}$ ar $\bar{s}$ i ISTU NINDA.KUR $\bar{a}$.RA $\bar{h}$ e $\bar{s}$ an $\bar{z}$ i, *ibid.* 14? The meaning of $\bar{s}$ uh $\bar{h}$ a in this connexion is particularly obscure. It should be the opposite, or at least the correlative, of $\bar{h}$ e $\bar{s}$ -.
3. NINDA.KUR $\bar{a}$.RA DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i, XVII 35 II 17, 20. I DUG $\bar{h}$ a-ni-i $\bar{s}$ - $\bar{s}$ a-a $\bar{s}$ KA $\bar{s}$ DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i, XVII 35 II 15, *VBoT* 26 10. IV PA ZIZ II PA GE $\bar{s}$ TIN DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i, etc. (see above, p. 120).
4. NINDA.KUR $\bar{a}$.RA DUG $\bar{h}$ ar- $\bar{s}$ i- $\bar{a}$ -a $\bar{s}$ (see p. 120 n. 1).

CONCORDANCE

Bold-face type denotes main text in this edition.

Ordinary type denotes variants and restorations in this edition.

A dash (—) denotes text broken, but implies that a corresponding line once existed.

A	B	C	D	2156/g
I 1	I 1	—		
2	2	—		
3	3	—		
4	4	—		
5/6	5	—		
6/7	6	—		
8	7	—		
9	8	—		
10	9	—		
11/12	10	—		
12/13	11	I 2		
13/14	12	3		
15	13	4		
16/17	14	5		
18/19	15	6/7		
19/20	16	7/8		
20/21	17	8/9		
21/22	18	9/10		
23	19	10/11		
24	20	11		
25	21	12/13		
26	21/22	13		
27	22	14		
II 1	23	15		
2	23	15/16		
3	—	16		
4	—	17		

A	B	C	D	2156/g
5	—	17/18		
6	—	18/19		
7	—	19/20		
8	—	20		
9	—	21		
10	—	22		
11	—			
12	—	23		
13	—	23/24		
14	—	24/25		
15	—	25/26		
16	—	(26)		
17	—	(27)		
18	—			
19	—	27/28		
20	—	29		
21	—	30		
22	—	31		
—	—	32-58		
III 1-15	—			
16	II 1			
17	2			
		II 1	—	—
		2	—	—
		3	—	—
		4-9	—	↑
		10	I 2	
		11	3	
		12	—	
		13	4	
		14	5	
		15	(6)	
		16	6	↓
		17	7/8	—
		18	8/9	—
		19	9/10	—

A	B	C	D	2156/g
		20	10/11	—
		21	11	—
		22	11/12	—
		23	13	—
		24	14	—
		25	15	—
		26	16	—
		27	16/17	—
		28	17/18	—
		29	18	—
			19	—
		30	19/20	—
		31	20	—
		32	21	—
		33	21/22	—
		34	22/23	—
		35	23/24	—
		36	24	—
		37	24	—
		38	25	—
		39	26	—
		40	27	—
		41	27/28	—
		42	28	—
		43	II 1/2	—
		44	2/3	—
		45	3	—
		46	4	—
		47	5	—
		48	6	—
		49	7	—
		50	7/8	—
		51	8	—
		52/53	9	—
		54	10	—
		55	10/11	—
		56	11	—
		57	11/12	—

A	B	C	D	2156/g
		58	12/13	—
		59	13	—
		59/60	14	—
		—	15	—
		—	16	—
		—	17	—
III 18/19	II 3	—		
19/20	4	—		
20/21	5	—		
21/22	5	—		
22/IV 1	6	III 1/2		
IV 2/3	7	2-4		
3/4	8	4-6		
5/6	9	6/7		
6/7	10	8/9		
7/8	11	10/11		
		12-16		
9/10	12	17/18		
10/11	13	18-20		
		21-25		
12	14	(26)		
12	14	(27)		
13	15			
14/15	16	28		
		29-37		
15	17	38 ?		
16	17	39/40		
17	18	40/41		
		41-43		
18	18/19	43/44		
19-21		IV 1-8	II 18-24	

INDEX

FOREWORD

THE index contains every word in the text as here presented, including variants and restorations, and any other words discussed in the commentary. References to the commentary are by pages, denoted by figures in *italics*. References to the four copies of the text—A, B, C and D—are given independently, but as any given reference may appear in this edition either as a variant in a footnote or as a restoration in the main text, as well as in the main text itself, a concordance has been prepared from which the corresponding line in the main text can always be readily ascertained. In order to avoid unnecessary references, in the case of duplicate readings the main text only has been cited; the other texts have been mentioned only where they have a reading differing from that in the main text. Square brackets have been placed round a reference only if the word is there entirely restored, *i.e.* is not even partly preserved on a duplicate. Where a word is partly preserved or is doubtful for any other reason, this is indicated either in the transcription of the word or by a question-mark following the reference.

Lexicographical information has been kept as brief as possible. For each word only the primary meaning and the meaning or meanings which occur in the text (if other than the primary one) have been entered. For fuller treatment reference should be made to Sturtevant's *Hittite Glossary*. Literature also has only been cited if it is not mentioned in the *Glossary*.

The usual order of letters is adopted, namely :—

A, E, H, I, Ĭ, K/G, L, M, N, P/B, S, Š, T/D, U, Ū, Z.

For the infinite verb the terminology is that adopted by Sommer in *HAB*, p. 226, namely : forms in *-anna*, infinitive ; in *-yar* and *-mar*, verbal substantive ; in *-yan*, supine I ; in *-uṣanzi*, supine II.

The following abbreviations are used :—

A. or acc.	.	.	.	.	Accusative.
Abl.	.	.	.	.	Ablative.
Adv.	.	.	.	.	Adverb.
D. or dat.	.	.	.	.	Dative.
Do.	.	.	.	.	Ditto.
Dur.-dist.	.	.	.	.	Durative-distributive.
Encl.	.	.	.	.	Enclitic.
G. or gen.	.	.	.	.	Genitive.
Idg.	.	.	.	.	Ideogram.
Imp.	.	.	.	.	Imperative.
Inst.	.	.	.	.	Instrumental.
L. or loc.	.	.	.	.	Locative.
Med.-pass.	.	.	.	.	Medio-passive.
N. or nom.	.	.	.	.	Nominative.
Neut.	.	.	.	.	Neuter.

Pl.	.	.	.	.	Plural.
Postpos.	.	.	.	.	Postposition.
Pres.	.	.	.	.	Present.
Pret.	.	.	.	.	Preterite.
Ptc.	.	.	.	.	Participle.
Sg.	.	.	.	.	Singular.
Subst.	.	.	.	.	Substantive.
Sup.	.	.	.	.	Supine.

1. WORDS AND NUMERALS

A

-a (encl.) 'and, also' (after vowels and ideograms -*ia*, *q.v.*).

Rare as sentence-connective.

(104, 114 f.).

A II 5, III 7, 17, IV 14, 15 (?); B I 4, 10, II 11, 13; C I 32,
34 *bis*, 35, 36, 38, 40, 43 *bis*, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 55, II 15,
49; D I 24.

-a- (encl.) 'he, she, it, they.'

N. sg. -aš, C II 57.

A. sg. -an, C I 42.

N.-a. sg. neut. -at, A II [18], III 15; B I 14; C II 2, 7,
10, 19, 21, 22, 25, 31, 39, 48, 51; D I 11, II 12.

N. pl. -aš, C I 53, II 12.

ak- 'die.'

Pret. 3 pl. a-ki-ir, D I 4.

e-kir, C II 7, 10, 13.

Dur-dist. med.-pass. pres. 3 sg. ak-ki-iš-ki-it-ta-ri, D II [18].

A.QAR 'field,' see *s.v.* A.ŠĀ.

ANA 'to,' sign of dat.

A II 18, III [2], 6, 20, IV 20; B I 1, 8, II 4, 11, 12; C I 26,
41, 56, II [1 *bis*], 14, 24, 31, 33 *bis*, (35), 42, 45, 51, 54,
III 11, 15, 16, 17 [*bis*], [36], 41; D I 8, [22], II 10.

Superfluous ANA, due to misunderstanding of dictated
Hittite word.

101.

ani^{ia}- 'work, perform; sow (a field); inscribe (a tablet).'

85.

Pres. 3 pl. a-ni-ia-an-zi, C II 8.

Pret. 1 sg. a-ni-ia-nu-un, C IV 3.

Dur.-dist. pret. 3 pl. an-ni-eš-kir, C II 7.

anna- 'mother.'

N. sg. *an-na-aš*, C I 46.

ANŠU 'ass.'

G. pl. ANŠU-*aš*, B II 15.

ANŠU.GĪR.NUN.NA 'mule.'

G. pl. ANŠU.GĪR.NUN.NA.ĜĪLA-*aš*, A IV 13.

ANŠU.KUR.RA 'horse.'

G. pl. ANŠU.KUR.RA-*aš*, A IV 13, C III 27 (?).

anda (postpos.) 'in.'

A III 6; B I 11; C II 56; D II 18 (?).

As preverb, see *s.v.* *au-*, *ehu*, *mem(i_u)a-*, *nai-*.

40 f.

antuḥša- 'man,' idg. LŪ.

N. sg. *an-tu-uh-ya-aḥ-ḥa-aš*, C I 41.

78.

LŪ, C II 58.

G. sg. LŪ-*aš*, A III 13.

-apa particle of unknown meaning.

na-pa, D II 11 (varies with *na-aš-ta*).

apa- 'that, the aforesaid.'

N.-a. sg. neut. *a-pa-a-at*, A IV 18, C III [44].

A. sg. *a-pu-u-un*, C II 58.

G. sg. *a-pi-e-da-aš*, B II 11, C III 11, D II [15].

D. sg. *a-pi-e-da-ni*, C II 16.

apiḫa 'there.'

a-pi-ḫa, C IV 3.

LŪ APIN.LAL 'farmer.'

Pl. LŪ.MEŠ APIN.LAL, B II 9, C II 6 (?), III 7.

appa 'again, in return,' idg. EGIR.

a-ap-pa, D II 1.

EGIR-*pa*, B I 11, C I 53, II 43, III [14].

See also *kappuḫa-*.

ar- 'come,' med.-pass. 'stand.' *anda ar-* med.-pass. 'stand by, beside (?).'

41.

NA⁴ARĀ 'mill-stone, mill.'

SAL.MEŠ NA⁴ARĀ 'women of the mill,' B II 9, C II 9, III 7.

arahzanda 'around, outside.'

a-ra-ah-ḥa¹-an-da, C II 27, with *ḥa* for *za* (95).

arahažena- 'surrounding, neighbouring, foreign.'

N.-a. neut. sg. or pl. *a-ra-aḥ-zé-na*, D II 3.

N. pl. *a-ra-aḥ-zé-ni-e-eš*, D II 7.

D. pl. *a-ra-aḥ-zé-na-aš*, C II 45.

arahaženant- = *arahažena-*.

N. pl. *a-ra-aḥ-zé-na-an-te-eš*, C II 49.

arant- = *ānt-* 'hot' ?

122^a.

arayaanni- 'free.'

103.

arayeš- 'become free.'

Pret. 3 sg. *a-ra-u-e-eš-ta*, C II 42.

Pret. 3 pl. *a-ra-u-e-eš-še-ir*, D I 28.

arḥa 'away' (preverb). See s.v. *yiḥa-*, *pessiḥa-*, *ḡarnu-*.

arḥaijan 'apart, separately.'

118 f.

ar-ḥa-ḡa-an, C IV 8.

argama- 'tribute.'

103.

A. pl. *ar-ga-mu-uš*, C II 42.

arkuḡa- 'pray.'

49^a.

Verbal subst. *ar-ku-ḡa-ar* 'prayer,' A IV 21.

aršk- (dur.-dist. of *ar-* 'come') 'make incursions (into), invade.'

105 f.

Pret. 3 sg. *a-ar-[aš-ki-iš]*, D II 3.

aruna- 'sea.'

L. sg. *a-ru-ni*, B I 8.

aruḡa(i)- 'bow down before, worship.'

Dur.-dist. pres. 3 pl. *a-ru-ú-i-iš-kán-zí*, C I 58 (?).

A.ŠĀ 'field.'

A.ŠĀ A.QAR, A IV 3.

A.ŠĀ A.QAR.ḤIA, C II 6, 7, III 4.

ašayar 'sheepfold.'

N.-a. sg. *a-ša-a-u-ḡa-ar*, C II [13].

Abl. sg. *a-ša-u-na-az*, C II 12.

aššiyant- (ptc. of *aššiya-* 'love') 'beloved, dear.'

N. sg. *aš-ši-ḡa-an-za*, C I 41.

aššanuyant- (ptc. of *aššanu-* 'prepare') 'cared for, tended, celebrated.'

80.

N. sg. *aš-ša-nu-ḡa-an-za*, C I 45 (?), 50, 54.

aššu- 'good' (*i.e.* beneficial) [Sommer, *HAB* 46 ff.]. (110).

N.-a. sg. neut. *a-aš-šu*, C II [47], D II 5.

Inst. *a-aš-ša-u-ù*, D II [14].

N. pl. *a-aš-ša-u-e-eš*, C II 56.

a-aš-ša-a-u-e-eš, D II 11.

aššul 'good' (*i.e.* good condition, excellence; blessing, benefit). (71).

D. sg. *aš-šu-li*, C III [16], A III 2.

-ašta (encl.), particle of unknown meaning.

B I 11; C II 17, 23, 29, 41, 55, III 15, IV 6; D II 14.

atta- 'father.'

N. sg. *at-ta-aš*, C I 46.

au- 'see.'

Imp. 3 pl. *ù-ya-an-du*, D I 12.

Dur.-dist. pres. 2 pl. *uš-ka-at-te-ni*, D I 10.

anda au- 'look at.'

Imp. 2 pl. *a-uš-te-en*, D II 14.

auliu- 'sacrificial animal' (?).

59 f.

G. sg. (?) *a-ù-li-uš*, A II 5.

N. (?) pl. *a-ù-li-(ù)-uš*, C II 11, 15.

AUATU 'word, matter.'

Pl. *A-ŪA-TE^{MEŠ}*, C IV 2, 6.

LŪAZU 'seer.'

89^a.

Pl. *LŪ.MEŠAZU*, C II 21.

E

É 'house.'

É-TUM, C II [57].

See also *É DINGIR*.

eḫu 'up! come!'

anda e-ḫu 'come in!', B I 11.

ek- 'die,' see *ak-*.

EGIR 'back, after, behind,' as subst. 'rear, future.'

EGIR UD-MI 'rear of days, *i.e.* future,' B II 13 (*ŠA* probably omitted).

ŠA EGIR UD-MI, A III 5, B II 16, C III 19, [28].

See also *appa*.

EN 'lord.'

EN(-*NI*), B I 6.

N. sg. EN-*aš*, C I 35, 47.

LŪ*EPIŠ* KAT 'maker of linen, weaver,' describing Gasga-folk. (101).

Pl. LŪ.MEŠE-*PIŠ*/PÍ-*IŠ* KAT.(*ĦI.A*), C II 39, D I 26.

GIŠERIN 'cedar.'

Abl. sg. GIŠERIN-*an-za*, B I 10.

eš- 'be.'

Pres. 3 sg. *e-eš-zi*, A II 2, 6; B I 17; C I 13, 14, 34.

Pret. 3 pl. *e-še-ir*, D I 26 *bis*.

(?) *e-eš-šir*, C II 39.

Imp. 2 sg. *e-eš*, B I 13.

3 sg. *e-eš-du*, B II 19, C III 44.

Confused with *ešša-*.

61, 102.

ešša- 'make' (dur.-dist. of *iša-*).

Pres. 3 sg. *e-eš-ša-i*, A IV 21.

3 pl. *e-eš-ša-an-zi*, A II 8, C I 19.

Pret. 3 pl. *e-eš-še-ir*, C II [9].

Confused with *eš-*.

61, 102.

É DINGIR 'temple.'

Sg. É DINGIR-*LIM*, A II 16, C I 8.

Pl. É DINGIR.MEŠ, D I 19.

É.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ, A I 25, B I 16.

É.ĦI.A DINGIR.MEŠ, A III 21, C II 30 (?).

eya- a plant.

91².

EZEN 'festival'; *a-* stem.

58.

Pl. EZEN.MEŠ, A II 6.

EZEN.ĦI.A, A II 3, B I 18, C I 18, 24.

EZEN.ĦI.A-*i(t-ta)*, A II 3.

(58).

Ħ

ħahħašitti- a plant.

(91²).

ĦA.LA 'portion,' *i.e.* rations?

82 f.

ĦA.LA(-*ŠU-NU*), C I 52.

ħali 'enclosure; pen, corral.'

N. sg. *ħa-a-ħi*, C II 13.

Abl. sg. *ħa-a-ħi-ia-az*, C II 11.

ħalki- 'grain, corn.'

G. sg. *ħal-ki-ia-aš*, A III 11, B II 14, C III 26.

ħalza- 'shout, recite, read, say (a short prayer)' [Götze, *Tunnawi*, 31-41].

Pres. 3 sg. *ħal-za-(a-)i*, B II 19, C III 44.

ħamišħant- 'spring,' season of thunder.

(121).

G. sg. *ħa-mi-iš-ħa-an-da-aš*, A II 4.

ħa-me-eš-ħa-an-da-aš, C I 17.

ħanneššar 'law-suit, judgment.'

G. sg. *ħa-an-ni-eš-na-aš*, C I 35, 48.

ħa-an-ni-eš-na-š(a-az), C I 47.

ħanta(i)- 'fix, prepare,' idg. SI×DI; *anda ħanta(i)*- 'make common cause with.'

41.

Imp. 3 pl. SI×DI-*an-du*, C II [21].

ħantant-, extended form of *ħanta*- 'firm, true, sure' (?).

74 f.

G. sg. *ħa-an-ta-an-da-š(a-az)*, C I 34.

parā ħantant- 'uplifted, inspired.'

76 f.

N. sg. *ħa-an-da-an-za*, C I 40, 47.

ħanti 'special.'

ħa-an-ti, C IV 8.

ħanzašša- 'grandson.'

A. pl. *ħa-an-za-aš-šu-uš*, A III 9.

ħar(k)- 'have.'

Imp. 2 sg. *ħar-ak*, A III 4, B I 14.

Pres. 2 pl. *ħar-te-ni*, C II 17.

ħark- 'perish.'

Pres. 3 pl. *ħar-kán-zi*, C II 56.

Pret. 3 sg. *ħar-ak-ia*, C II 18.

? *ħar*[. . .], C II 59 = D II 13 (109 f.).

ħarganu- 'cause to perish, destroy.'

Imp. 3 pl. *ħar-ga-nu-ya-an-du*, A III [15].

ħarnink- 'cause to perish, destroy.'

Pret. 3 sg. *ħar-ni-in-ki-iš-ki-üt*, C II 47.

ħaršallant- 'angry.'

(111).

N.-a. pl. neut. *ħar-šal-la-an-ta*, A III 19.

- DUG^haršī = DUG^haršū^halli, a large storage vessel, associated with seasonal festivals. 120 ff.
- NINDA^haršī- (= NINDA.KUR₄.RA) 'ordinary, regular bread, regular food-offering.' 55.
 A. sg. NINDA^har-šī-in, C II 5.
 Inst. NINDA^har-šī-it, B I 12.
- NA⁴ĤAR.ŠU, a kind of mill-stone. 120.
^haš-, ^heš- 'open.' (98).
 Dur.-dist. pres. 3 pl. ^ha-aš-kán-zi, C I 53.
- ^hašša- 'grandson.'
 A. pl. ^ha-aš-šu-uš, A III 9.
- *^haššūššara- 'queen'? 45.
^haštai 'bone,' hence 'defensive strength.' (42).
^haštuir 'branches.' (91).
^hattatar 'wisdom.' 88 f.
- N.-a. sg. ^ha-at-ta-tar, C II 18.
^ha-at-ta-ta, D I 8.
- ^hattulatar 'health.'
 N.-a. sg. ^ha-at-tu-la-tar, B II 12, C III 18 (?).
^ha-ad-du-la-tar, A III 5, IV 10.
- ^hazzī^hi, some kind of entertainment. 68¹.
 'GAR' ^hazzizita, meaning unknown. (47).
- ^heš- 'open,' see ^haš-.
- ^heu- 'rain.' (115).
^he-e-mu-uš (case doubtful), A IV 15.
- ^himma- 'a feast of communion with a deity; food and drink used therein' (?). 62 ff.
 A. pl. ^hi-im-mu-uš, C I 24.
- L^U^himmalli- one who officiates at the ^himma- (?). 68².
- ^hinkan 'fate, death, plague.'
 N.-a. sg. ^hi-in-kán, A III 17, B II 10, C II 3, 32, D II 15.
 Abl. sg. ^hi-in-ga-na-an-za, C II 25.
^hi-in-ka-na-an-za, D I 15.
- ^hinganiša- 'dancing.' (71).
^hulaleššar 'circuit.' 78 f.
 Loc. ^hu-u-la-li-eš-ni, C I 43.

ḥumant- 'all.'

N. sg. *ḥu-u-ma-an-za*, C II 28.

N.-a. sg. neut. *ḥu-u-ma-an*, C I 25, II 4 (?).

G. sg. *ḥu-u-ma-an-da-(a)-aš*, C I 46, II 47, D II 5.

N. pl. *ḥu-u-ma-an-te-eš*, C II 50.

ḥu-u-ma-an-[-], C III 25.

DUG_{ḥuppar} varies with DUG_{ḥarši}.

122^a.

ḥurla- 'Ḫurrian.'

93.

ḥur-la-aš KUR-*e* 'land of the Ḫurrians,' D I 17.

ḪUR.SAG 'mountain.'

D. pl. *A-NA* HUR.SAG.MEŠ, B I 8.

ḥuṣant- 'wind,' idg. IM.

N. pl. *IM-an-te-eš*, C III 40.

A. pl. *ḥu-u-ṣa-du-uš*, B II 17.

ḥuṣ-an-du-uš, C III 38.

ḥuṣap- 'malign' (?).

(73).

ḥuēš- 'live.'

Imp. 3 sg. *ḥu-i-eš-du*, C III [14].

ḥuṣitar 'wild life, animals.'

Inst. (in comitative sense) *ḥu-u-it-ni-it*, B II 15.

ḥuṣittia(n)(ešk)- 'pull' (dur.-dist.).

(46 ff.).

I

iṣa- 'make, do'; *šarā iṣa-* 'extol' (?), 96.

Pres. 3 sg. *i-iṣa-zi*, C II 6.

1 pl. *i-iṣa-e-ni*, D I 9.

3 pl. *i-iṣa-an-zi*, C II [10], 29 (*šarā*).

i-en-zi, D I 18 (*šarā*).

Pret. 2 pl. *i-iṣa-at-ten*, C II 3 (?).

Sup. 2 *i-iṣa-u-ṣa-an-zi*, C I 24.

Dur.-dist. see s.v. *ešša-*.

iṣa- 'go, proceed' (med.-pass. only).

Pres. 3 sg. *iṣ[-iṣa-at-ta-ri]*, C II 2.

Imp. 3 pl. *i-iṣa-an-ta/da-ru*, B II 17, C III 40.

IGI 'eye,' pl. IGI.ḪI.A used as sg. [Götze, *Tunnawi*, fn. 254].

Inst. IGI.ḪI.A-*it*, D II 14.

italiia- 'desire.'

Dur.-dist. pres. 3 pl. *i-la-li-eš/iš-kán-zi*, A III 22, B II 6.

IM 'wind,' see s.v. *huruanti-*.

IM 'clay,' associated with *himma-*.

69 f.

INA 'in, into.'

A I 26, II 2, 6, IV (17); B I 9, 16, 18; C I 21, 23, IV 4,
5 bis; D II 16.

Superfluous INA, due to misunderstanding of dictated

Hittite word.

115 f.

innarā 'angrily, spitefully' (??).

73 f.

in-na-ra-a, A III 15 (?).

innaraxatar 'manliness' (?).

in-na-ra-ya-tar, A III [6], B II 13, C III [18].

IBILA (DUMU NITA) 'son, heir.'

Pl. IBILA.MEŠ, A III 9 (?).

ippiia-, meaning unknown; EZEN *ippiiaš* 'festival of the *ippiia-*.' 122².

İR 'slave, servant.'

Sg. B I 4, C I 22.

Pl. İR.MEŠ, A II 11 (?).

išhuua- 'pour' with DUG*haršijalli*.

(121).

DUG*išpanduzzi*, a vessel of wine, used for the ration of wine
which it contains; not used for libating.

55 f.

A. sg. DUG*iš-pa-an-du/tu-zi*, C II 5, III 42, D I 5.

Inst. DUG*iš-pa-an-du-(uz)-zi-it*, A I 14, B I 12.

ištamana- 'ear.'

A. sg. *iš-ta-ma-na-an*, B I 14.

ištamaš- 'hear'; *anda ištamaš-* 'hear in somebody's house' (?) (41).

Imp. 2 pl. *iš-ta-ma-aš-ten*, C II 2.

Dur.-dist. pres. 2 sg. *iš-ta-ma-aš-ki-ši*, C I 38.

imp. 2 sg. *iš-ta-ma-aš-ki*, B I 14+A I 17+C I 5.

ištarna 'inside, among.'

iš-tar-na, C I 30, 31 bis, 45, 49.

iš-tar-na-aš, A II 21.

İŠTU 'by, with, from,' sign of inst. or abl. case.

104.

A I 25, III 16; C II 44.

it 'go!'

i-it, B I 5.

idalayatar 'harm, injury.'

D. sg. *i-da-a-la-u-ya-an-ni*, D I 19.

idahu- 'bad, harmful, wicked.'

N.-a. sg. neut. *i-da-a-lu*, D II 15.

A. sg. *i-da-(a)lu-un*, A III 16, B II 10, C II 32, III 9.

ITU 'month.'

EZEN ITU 'monthly festival,' A II 3.

I

-ia- (encl.) 'and' = *-a* after vowels and ideograms.

A III 12, B II 11, C II 5, 13, [16], 41, 44, 47, III 12, 20, IV 5.

-IA 'my,' B I 15.

IA 'oil.'

Abl. sg. *IA-an-za*, B I 10.

K, G

-KA 'thy.'

A II [11], 16 *bis*, [17] *bis*; B I 4, 5; C I 8, 22, II 52.

KÁ 'gate' (*plurale tantum*).

(70¹), 83.

Acc. *KÁ-uš*, C I 54.

kā-, *ki/e-* 'this.'

N.-a. sg. *ki-i*, B I [1], C II 3.

Abl. sg. (as adv.) *ki-e-iz*, C II 25, D I 15.

N.-a. pl. *ki-e*, C II 38, 41.

ki-i, C IV 6, D I 15.

GAL ('great'), a libation bowl.

56.

Pl. GAL.HI.A, A II [1], [17], B II 6; C III [2].

GIŠGÁL 'door'; Hittite equivalent an *-a* stem, not *kattaluzzi*.

83².

C I 53.

LÚKALA(G) 'strong (man)' = Hittite *šarku-*.

44.

kalankant- 'nourished' [Zuntz, *TIS* 53 f.]; *parā kalankant-*

'fully nourished' (?).

56.

N. sg. *parā ka-la-a-an-kán/ga-an-za*, B I 13, C I 4.

kalleš- 'summon, invite.'

(53).

Imp. 3 sg. *kal-li-iš-du*, B I 11.

kallištaruani 'for an invitation to a feast' (??).

87.

-*kan*, encl. particle of direction.

A II 10, III 16; B I 1, 7, II 4, C I 30 *bis*, 31, 33, 37, 40,
45, 49, 54 (?), II 11, 28.

kappu_ua 'count'; *appa kappu_ua* 'count over.' (70).

Ptc. n.-a. sg. neut. *kappu_ua-an*, A II 18 (*appa*).

É*karimn*- 'temple'; idg. É DINGIR. 54 f.

D.-l. É*ka-ri-im-ni*, B I 11.

LŪ*karim*(*ma*)*nala*- = LŪ É DINGIR 'temple attendant.' (54).

*karp*i- 'anger.' (108).

N. sig. *kar-pi-iš*, C II 54.

karš- 'cut; select; castrate (??)'. 85 ff.

Med.-pass. pres. 3 pl. *kar-š[a-an-ta-ri]*, C II 15.

Dur.-dist. pret. 3 pl. *kar-aš-k[i-ir]*, C II 12.

karša-(?) 'locust.' 74.

A. sg. *kar[?]-ša-an*, A III 17.

karšattar 'a cutting; a separation; section (of a field)'. 87¹.

kart- 'heart.' (108).

kartimmi_{at}- 'anger.' (108).

N. sg. *kar-tim-mi-_{ia}-az*, C II 54.

kar^{di}-dim-mi-_{ia}-az, D II 10.

karū 'formerly, already.'

ka-ru-ū, C II 44.

karūli- 'ancient, former.' (82).

D.-l. pl. *ka-ru-ū-i-li-_{ia}-š(a)*, C I 49, 51.

'Ancient Gods.' 81 f.

KAS 'road'; KAS-az *h_uitti_{ia}*- 'draw, attract, from a journey.' (47).

kāša 'behold!'

ka-a-ša, B I 12.

GAŠAN 'lady, mistress, queen.'

GAŠAN-*IA*, C III 10.

kašt- 'hunger, famine.'

A. sg. *ka/ga-(a)š-ta-an*, A III 17; B II 11; C II 32,

III 10; D I 21.

KAT 'cloth,' see *s.v.* EPIŠ.

QATI 'finished.'

QA-TI, A IV 19.

kattayatar 'vengeance.' (98).

N.-a. sg. *kat-ta-ya-(a-)tar*, C II 31, 51; D I 20.

KA × *U* 'mouth.'

Abl. *KA* × *U-az*, [C II 1].

kenu 'open.' (121, 123).

GEŠTIN 'wine,' *GIŠGEŠTIN* 'vine.'

G. sg. *GIŠGEŠTIN-aš*, A II 11, B II 14, C III [26].

See also *s.v.* *NU.GIŠ.SAR* and *GIŠSAR*.

ki 'lie, be placed'; *šarū ki* 'be elevated, presented' (med.-pass. only). (117).

Pres. 3. sg. *ki-it-ta-ri*, C III 43.

kilu, a kind of ritual or sacrifice. (59¹).

GIM 'when, as,' Hittite *mahhan*. (104).

GIM-an, A IV 19.

GÌM 'handmaid.'

B I 5, A II [11].

gimant- 'winter.'

G. sg. *gi-im-ma-an-ta-aš*, A II 4.

gimra- 'plain.'

G. sg. *gi-im-ra-aš*, B II 15.

kinun 'now.'

ki-nu-un, B I 10.

ki-nu-n(a), C II 49.

ginzu 'mercy'; (*UZU*) *ginzu* 'bosom, genitals.' 76.

N.-a. sg. *gi-in-zu*, C I 40, III 36 (?).

gi-en-zu, C II 24.

ginzuyala- 'merciful.' 76.

N. sg. *gi-in-zu-ya-la-aš*, C I 39.

GÌR 'foot.'

Pl. *GÌR.MEŠ*, A III 15.

kiš- 'become' (med.-pass. only), *anda kiš-* 'become intimate with' (?). (41).

Imp. 3 sg. *ki-(i-)ša-(a-)ru*, C II 31, 52; D I 20, II 9.

GID.DA 'long.'

A III 5, B II 13, C III 20.

kui- 'who.'

N. sg. *ku-iš*, C II 54, 55.

N.-a. sg. neut. *ku-it*, B I 13; C II [3], 19; D I 9.

Abl. sg. *ku-e-iz*, C II 12.

N. pl. *ku-(i)-e-eš*, B II 4, 5, 6, 7, 9; C II 6 (?), 9, III 4, 6.

N.-a. pl. *ku-e*, C II 1, B II 3, D I 16 (?).

A. pl. *ku-i-uš*, C II 46, D II 4 *bis*.

D. pl. *ku-e-da-aš*, A III 21.

kui-+ki 'any; quisquam' (after negative).

N. sg. *ku-iš-ki*, A II 19, C II 5 (?), 8.

GUL 'strike,' see *s.v.* *uallhanniā-*.

kunk- 'adorn, deck out' (?).

90.

Pres. 1 pl. *ku-un-ku-u-u-e-ni*, D I 13 (?).

kunna- 'right.'

N.-a. sg. neut. *ku-un-na-an*, D I 9.

-KUNU 'your.'

A III 21, IV 3; C III 4 *bis*, 5, 42.

KUBABBAR 'silver.'

KUBABBAR, A II 1, B II 7, C I 12, II 47.

G. sg. *ŠA KUBABBAR*, C III [2].

D. sg. *ANA KUBABBAR*, C I 26.

KUR 'land, country,' see *s.v.* *udne*.

LÚKÚR 'enemy; hostile.'

A III 14; B I 9, II 3, 11, C III 11.

kureššar 'strip of cloth.'

(47).

kuriyana- 'independent.'

94 f.

N. pl. (?) *ku-ri-ya-na-aš*, D I 16.

kurur 'hostility, rebellion.'

N.-a. sg. *ku-(u)-ru-ur*, C II 32, D I 21.

Abl. sg. *ku-(u)-ru-ra-an-za*, C II 26, D I 16.

GUŠKIN 'gold.'

A II 1, B II 7, C I 12, 26, II 47, III [2].

'KUG.UD = GI,' A II 1, IV 2, for GUŠKIN, or possibly
for KUBABBAR GUŠKIN.

58.

GUD 'ox.'

G. sg. ŠA GUD, A III 11.

N. pl. GUD.ĜI.A, C II 11.

G. pl. GUD.(ĜI.A)-aš, C III [27].

See also s.v. SIPA.

kuuapikki 'anywhere' (after neg.).*ku-ya-pi-ik-ki*, A I 24, II 8, B I 17, 22; C I 11.

L

la- 'loose, release.'Imp. 2 pl. *la-a-at-ten*, C II 36.*lag-* 'bend.'Ptc. n.-a. sg. neut. *la-ga-a-an*, B I 14.*laknu-* 'cause to bend or fall, contrive (somebody's) downfall.' (73).*lalukkima-* a pleasant bodily condition; warmth (??). 79.N. sg. *la-lu-uk-ki-ma-aš*, C I 44.A. sg. *la-lu-uk-ki-ma-an*, A III 7 (?).*laman* 'name,' idg. ŠUM.

ŠUM(-KA), C II 52.

N.-a. sg. ŠUM-an, C I 30.

D.-1. pl. *lam-na-aš*, C I 30.

ŠUM.ĜI.A-aš, A II 21.

layar- 'despoil' (?). 96 f.Infin. *la-u-ya-ar-ru-na*, C. II 30*lē* 'not' (prohibitive).*lē-e*, C II 53, 55 (+D II 11).

Omitted, D II 9 (107).

LÚ 'man,' see s.v. *antuhša-*.

LUGAL 'king.'

N. sg. LUGAL-uš, B I 4, C I 22.

A. sg. LUGAL, A II [4].

D. sg. LUGAL-i, C III [15].

ANA LUGAL, A IV 20, B II 12, C III [17].

See also s.v. DUMU.

LUGAL-*uiznatar* 'kingship.'

A. sg. LUGAL-u-iz-na-tar, C I 36.

M

-*ma* (encl.) 'but, and (δέ).'

A II 7, III 16; B I 16, 19, II 5, 6, [7], 9 (?); C I 13, 30,
II 30, 35, 36, 38, III 4 (?), 6 (?), [14], IV 7; D II 14,
15, 16.

ma- 'thrive.'

Imp. 3 sg. *ma-a-ú*, B II 18, C III [40].

maḥḥan 'as,' used as particle of comparison following noun. 104 f.

maleşk- 'grant forgiveness' (??). 78.

mān 'if' [Sommer, *HAB* 238].

ma-a-an, B I 7, 8; C II 57; D II 10, 18.

'like,' particle of comparison, following noun [Sommer,
HAB 238]. 104 f.

ma-a-an, C II 45.

maninkuyan 'near.'

ma-ni-in-ku-ya-an, C I 27.

MÁŠ 'goat.'

G. pl. *MÁŠ.HI.A-aš*, B II 14.

MÁŠ-aš, C III [27].

meḵana-: MU *meḵana-* 'half year.' 58 f.

G. sg. *me-e-a-na-aš*, A II 3.

mī-i-ḡa-na-aš, C I 16.

mem(iḡ)a- 'say'; *anda mem(iḡ)a-* 'address.' 40 f.

Imp. 3 sg. *me-e-ma-a-ú*, D I 11.

Dur.-dist. pres. 1 sg. *me-mi-iš-ki-mi*, B I 14.

2 sg. *me-mi-eš-ki-ši*, C I 57.

3 sg. *me-mi-iš-k[i-iz-zi]*, B I 1 (*anda*).

pret. 1 sg. *me-mi-iš-ki-nu-un*, C IV 7 (*anda*), D II
[22] (*anda*).

mer- 'die' (??). (91).

meš- (?) 'thrive, be abundant' (-eš- form of *ma*). 114 f.

Imp. 3 sg. *mī-e-eš-du*, A IV 15.

3 pl. (?) *mī-e-eš-ša-du*, B II 16.

miḡatar 'abundance.'

N.-a. sg. *mī-ḡa-(a)-tar*, B II 16, C III 28.

mī-i-ḡa-ta, A III 12.

miṣeš- (?) 'be soft, gentle, rich' (denom. from *miṣu-*).

114 f.

See *s.v.* *meš-*.

MU 'year.'

MU.KAM, B II 13, C III [20].

MU.KAM.ḪI.A, A III 5.

G. sg. MU-*aš*?, A II 3.

MU-TI, C I 16.

-*mu* 'me; to me.'

B I 4, 14; D II 19.

muga- 'pray, entreat,' not 'lament.'

45 ff.

Imp. 2 sg. *mu-ga-a-i*, B I 6.

Sup. 2 *mu-ga-u-ya-an-zi*, C IV 1 (?).

Dur.-dist. pres. 1 sg. *mu-ki-iš-ki-mi*, B I 12.

pret. 1 sg. *mu-ki-eš-ki-nu-un*, C IV 4, 6, D II 20 (?).

med.-pass. imp. 2 sg. *mu-ki-eš-ki-iḫ-ḫu-u[ti]*, C III 13.

mugayar 'prayer' (verbal subst. of *muga-*), associated with a particular literary type of prayer.

45 ff., 119.

N.-a. sg. [*mu-g*]*a-u-ya-ar*, C I 38.

G. sg. *mu-u-ga-u-ya-aš*, C IV 7.

mukeššar ' (ritual of) supplication.'

60 f.

G. sg. *mu-ki-iš-na-aš*, A II 5.

LÚMUŠEN.DÙ 'bird-breeder, augur.'

(189).

Pl. LÚ.MEŠMUŠEN.DÙ, C II [21].

N

NA₄ 'stone.'

Pl. NA₄.ḪI.A, A II 1.

naḫḫant- 'fearing, reverent, respectful' (ptc. of *naḫ-*).

N. sg. *na-aḫ-ḫa-an-za*, C I 23, II 55.

N. pl. *na-aḫ-ḫa-an-te-eš*, A II [12], B II 5.

naḫšarat- 'respect, reverence.'

N. sg. *na-aḫ-ša-ra-az*, C I 27.

na-aḫ-ša-ra-za, A II 17.

nai-, *ne-* 'turn'; *anda nai-* 'turn towards'; *parā nai-* 'turn outwards, unsheath' (?).

(41), 72.

Med.-pass. imp. 2 sg. *ne-iš-ḫu-ut*, A III [2], C III 17 (*anda*).

Ptc. a. sg. *ne-ia-an-ta-an*, A III 13 (?), C III 30 (?) (*parā*).

nakki- 'heavy; honoured.'

N. sg. *na-ak-ki-iš*, B I 3, 7, 15; C I 29, 32, 33.

N.-a. sg. neut. *na-ak-ki-i*, C I 30, 31.

nakkijaḥ- 'make honourable, honour.'

62.

Ptc. n.-a. sg. neut. *na-ak-ki-ia-aḥ-ḥa-an*, C I 22.

NAM 'locust,' Hit. *karša-*?

112.

Pl. NAM.ḪI.A, B II 11.

namma.

(1) As first word of sentence 'furthermore, again, nay':

A II 7; B I 16, 19; C I 13, 26, 31, 33.

(2) After *nu* 'therefore, so':

C II 4, 7, 10.

(3) Elsewhere 'again':

C II 31, 38, 52, III [37]; D I 14.

-naš (encl.) 'us; to us.'

D I 6.

našma 'or.'

na-aš-ma, B I 8, 9; C II 21, 22, 57, 58.

naššu 'either.'

na-aš-šu, C II 20.

nepiš- 'heaven.'

G. sg. *ne-pi-ša-aš*, C I 35, 43, 53, 54, 55.

D.-l. sg. *ne-pi-ši*, B I 7.

-NI 'our.'

B I 6 *bis*.

NINDA.KUR₄.RA 'ordinary bread, regular food-offering,' = Hitt.

ḥarši-.

(55).

Sg., C II 10.

Pl. NINDA.KUR₄.RA.ḪI.A, C II 9, 14, III 42.

NIŠ DINGIR 'oath.'

NI-IŠ/EŠ DINGIR.MEŠ, C II 29, D I 18.

nu 'and,' sentence connective, often untranslatable.

nu, A IV, 17; B I 7, II 3, 10, 16, 18; C I 21, 23, 27, [40],

II 3, 4, 7, 10, [12], 14, 19, 20, 24, 26, 28 *bis*, 36, 42, 43,

46, 47, 54, 58, III 9, 16, 35, 41, IV 3; D I 9, 19,

II 2, 17, 20, [22].

With enclitics :

na-, A II [18], III 15 ; B I 11, 14 ; C I 42, II 2, 7, 10,
17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 39, 41, 48, 51, 55, 57, III 15, IV 6 ;
D I 11.

nu-, A I 21, II 10, III 4, 6, [9], [10], 11, 13, 14 ; B I 12,
13 *bis*, 14, 15 ; C I 25, 30, 46, 48, [54], II 32, 52, III 12,
[28, 30, 31] ; D I 6, II 19.

NU.GÁL 'is not.'

C I 48, II 19.

LÚNU.GIŠ.SAR 'gardener.'

Pl. LÚ.MEŠNU.GIŠ.SAR, B II 9 (GEŠTIN and SAR),
C III 7.

nū-, meaning unknown.

(72).

A. sg. *nu-ú-un*, A III 10.

P, B

pa- 'go.'

Ptc. n. sg. (in perfective sense) *pa-a-an-za*, B I 9 *bis*.

(52).

pa- 'give.'

Imp. 2 sg. *pa-a-i*, B II 11, C III 11.

PANI 'before.'

PA-NI, A IV 20, C II 48.

panku- 'total, general ; assembly, congregation.'

116.

N. sg. *pa-(a)-an-ku-uš*, A IV 18, B II 18, C III 43.

parā 'forth' (preverb), see *s.v. kalank-*, *nai*, *da-*. As adv. 'more-
over,' C II 46.

parā *ḥandant-*, see *s.v. ḥantant-*.

parku- 'high.'

N.-a. sg. *pár-ku*, A I 25.

parkui- 'pure.'

N.-a. pl. *pár-ku-i*, B I 18, C I 25.

BA.UG₈ 'died.'

C II 4.

peš- 'give.'

Imp. 2 pl. *pí-iš-<te->en*, D II 15 (?).

pešk- 'give' (dur.-dist. of *pai-*).

Pres. 3 pl. *pi-iš-kán-zi*, A I 23, II 15; B I 20.

pi-eš-kán-zi, C I 10, 11, 26.

Imp. 2 sg. *pi-eš-ki*, A III 6, 9, 10, 12, 14; B II 13; C III [20], 28, [29, 31].

pi-iš-ki, B II 16.

peššūa- 'throw'; *arḥa peššūa-* 'throw away, repudiate' (tribute, etc.).

103.

Pret. 3 pl. *arḥa [pi-e-eš-]šir*, C II 43.

arḥa pi-e-eš-ši-i-e-ir, D II 1.

pedan 'place.'

Loc. *pi-di*, C I 48.

BIBRU 'rhyton.'

57 f.

Pl. *BI-IB-RI*^{PLA}, A II 1, 16 (?); B II 6; C III 2 (?).

-pit (encl.), particle of identity, sometimes = 'only.'

A I 26, II 2, 6; B I 16, 18; C I 21, 23, 32, 33, 35, 36,

37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56,

II 4, 38; D II 13.

puri- a kind of cover or garment; 'muzzle' (?).

64^b f.

S

SAG.DU 'head,' hence 'person.'

Gen. *ŠA SAG.DU(-NI)*, B I 6.

SAL 'woman.'

Pl. SAL.MEŠ, see s.v. ARĀ.

SALLUGAL 'queen.'

44 f.

N. sg. SALLUGAL-*aš*, A II [11], [III 4]; B I 4, III 12.

SAR 'vegetable'; GIŠSAR 'garden.'

Pl. GIŠSAR.MEŠ, C III 4.

GIŠSAR SAR 'vegetable-garden,' B II 8.

GIŠSAR GEŠTIN 'vineyard,' B II 8.

See also LÜNU.GIŠ.SAR.

SIPA.GUD 'cowherd.'

Pl. LÜ.MEŠSIPA.GUD, C II [12].

SIPA.ŠAH 'swineherd.'

Pl. LÜ.MEŠSIPA.ŠAH, C II 39.

SIPA.UDU 'shepherd.'

Pl. LÚ.MEŠSIPA.UDU, C II 13.

SISKUR.SISKUR 'sacrifice,' both as ceremony and offering.

Pl. SISKUR.SISKUR.ḪI.A, B I 18, C I 24, 50.

Sg., A I 22.

SI×DI, see *s.v.* *ḫanta(i)*-.
 Š

ŠA 'of,' sign of gen.

A II 9, III [5], 11; B I 6; C I 23, II 9, 38, III 2.

Omitted.

112.

ŠAH 'pig,' reared by Hittites.

101 f.

Gen. ŠAH-aš, A IV 13.

See also *s.v.* SIPA.

šalli- 'great,' idg. GAL; also = DUGGAL 'bowl'?

(56).

N. sg. šal-li-iš, C I 34.

šal-li-eš, C I 32.

-šan, particle of direction, usually with implication 'up, over, on,' etc.

B I 13; C I 26, 50, 51, II 32.

See also -zan.

šanezzi- 'excellent, first-class.'

(52).

N. sg. ša-ne-iz-zi-iš, B I 10.

šanḫešk- 'seek continually,' dur.-dist. of šanḫ-.

Pres. 3 pl. ša-an-ḫi-iš-kán-zi, B II 7, 8 (?), 10; C II 30,

III 3, 6, 8.

ŠAPAL 'under.'

ŠA-PAL, A III 15.

šarā 'up,' as preverb, see *s.v.* *ija-*, *ki-*, *tittanu-*.

šarḫana-, meaning unknown.

(105).

šarḫešk- (dur.-dist.) 'behave in the manner of a lion.'

105.

Pret. 3 sg. šar-ḫi-iš-ki-it, C II 45.

šarḫul, šarḫula-, meaning unknown.

(105).

šarḫuṣanti- 'womb.'

(105).

šarku- 'pre-eminent, mighty.'

44.

N. sg. šar-ku-uš, A III 3, B I 3.

šarkuṣa(i)- 'put on boots.'

44.

- šarlešk-* 'cause to prevail, exalt.' 78.
 Pres. 2 sg. [ša]r-li-eš-ki-ši, C I 42.
- GIŠšarpa-, a manufactured article or a kind of wood. 90 f.
 Abl. sg. GIŠšar-pa-aš, C II 23.
- šarra- 'tear, burst; violate' (a promise, a boundary), [Sommer, HAB 87 ff.; Götze, Tunnawi 45 ff.].
 Pret. 3 pl. šar-ri-ir, C II 29 (?).
 Med.-pass. pret. 3 pl. šar-ra-an-ta-ti, D I 18.
- šarrešk- (dur.-dist. of šarra-).
 Med.-pass. pres. 2 sg. šar-ri-iš-ki-ūt-ta, C I 55. (83).
- šayar 'wrath.' (108^a).
- NINDAšena- (58/b obv. I 8). (68).
- URUDšepikkušta- 'pin' (?), idg. ZI.KIN.BAR. 90.
 URUDše-pi-ik-ku-uš-ta-aš, D I 13.
- URUDZI.KIN.BAR-aš, C II 23.
- šer 'up, over; on behalf of.'
 (1) Adv., B I 7.
 (2) Postpos., A IV 20.
- GIŠšešan(n)a-(?), a tree, possibly 'almond.' 112 f.
 Gen. GIŠše-e-ša-(an-)na-aš, A IV 12, B II 14.
- šeššayar, variant of šešduyar 'prosperity,' q.v. 115.
 G. sg. še-e-eš-ša-u-ya-aš, A IV 16.
 ši-iš-ša-ya-aš, B II 17.
- šešd- 'prosper.'
 Imp. 3 sg. še-eš-du, ši-iš-du, še-iš-du, A IV 17, B II 18,
 C III 41.
- šešduyar 'prosperity' (verbal subst. from šešd-).
 G. sg. še-iš-du-ya-aš, C III 39.
- ši 'to him' (encl.).
 C III [28, 30], 31 (?).
- šma- (encl. poss. adj. 2 pers.) 'your.'
 N.-a. sg. neut. -šum-mi-it, C II 18.
 -(i)š-me-it, C III [42].
- šma- (encl. poss. adj. 3 pers.) 'their.'
 N.-a. sg. neut. -<šum->mi-it, D II 5.

-šmaš (encl.) 'to you.'

B II 9 (?); C II [4], III 4 (?), 6 (?).

-šmaš (encl.) 'to them.'

A III 4, 6, 9 (?), 10, 11, 13, 14.

ŠU 'hand' (Hitt. *keššar*).

D II [23].

šuh^hha- 'scatter, sprinkle,' with DUG^hharšⁱ.

(121).

IMŠU.GAR.RIN.NA 'oven' (?); equation with *himma*- question-
able.

69 f.

ŠU.GI 'old'; SALŠU.GI 'old woman' (a priestess).

(89).

Pl. SAL.MEŠŠU.GI, C II 21.

šullant- 'reviling, quarrelsome' (ptc. of šull(iⁱ)a-).

N.-a. pl. šu-ul-la-an-ta/da, A III 18, C II 34.

šull(iⁱ)a- 'scold, revile.'

96.

Pret. 3 sg., šu-ul-li-e-it, C II 28.

ŠUM 'name,' see s.v. *laman*.

šumeš 'you.'

Gen. šu-me-en-za-an, A III 21.

Dat. šu-ma-a-aš, C III 41.

-ŠUNU 'their' (Hitt. -šma-).

A III 6, 15; C I 52.

šuppi- 'holy.'

N.-a. sg. šu-up-pi, A I 22, II 15.

ŠU.DIM₄ 'fist; defensive strength.'

(42).

GIŠšuyaitar, a tree.

112^a.

T, D

-ta 'thee, to thee.'

A I 21, 25, II 1, 3, 7, 10; B I 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19; C I 13,

25, 30 bis, 33, 48.

da- 'take.'

Pres. 3 pl. da-an-zi, C II 43+D II 2.

Pret. 3 pl. da-a-(i)-ir, C II 50, D II 8.

Imp. 2 sg. da-a, C III [37].

2 pl. da[-at-ten], D I 14.

Inf. *da-an-na*, B II 7, 10; C III 3.

ta-an-na, C III 8.

(?) *parā d[a-*, C II 2.

Dur.-dist. *daš-_k*, q.v.

dai- 'put.'

Ptc. n. sg. *ti-ja-an-za*, A II 17.

talli-ja- 'entreat' (?), approximately synonymous with *muga-*. 49³.

tamai- 'other.'

N. sg. *da-ma-a-iš*, C I 33.

D.-l. sg. *ta-me-e-da-ni*, A I 27, II 7; B I 17, 19.

dam-me-e-da-ni, A I 23.

tamaš- 'pres, oppress.'

Med.-pass. pres. 3 sg. *ta-ma-(a)-aš-ta*, C II 26, D I 15.

tannataḥ- 'make empty, lay waste.'

Sup. 2 *tan-na-ta-aḥ-ḫu-u-ya-an-zi*, B II 8.

tan-na-at-ta-aḥ-ḫu-u-ya-an-zi, A IV 4.

ta-an-na-at-ta-u-ya-an-zi, C III 5 (116).

tapašša- 'fever.' 99.

A. sg. *ta-pa-aš-ša-an*, A III 16, B II 10, C II 33, III 9.

ta-pa-ša-an, A IV 7.

dapi- 'all.'

A. (or g. ?) pl. *da-pi-aš* (?), D II 5.

tarḫiḫi- 'heroic, valiant.'

A. sg. *tar-ḫu-u-i-li-in*, A III 13.

tarḫiḫilatar 'valour.'

N.-a. sg. *tar-ḫu-u-i-[la-tar]*, C III 29.

tari-ja- 'take pains.' 100.

tari-ja- 'invoke' (?), uncertain. 100¹.

tari-ja-ant- 'tired' (ptc. of *tari-ja-* 'take pains' ?). 99 ff.

N.-a. sg. *ta-ri-ja-an*, C II 35.

ta-ri-e-an, D I 23.

A. sg. *ta-ri-ja-an-da-an*, C II 36.

tari-ja-anu- 'invoke' (originally 'importune' ?). 49³.

tarna-, a measure. (68 f.).

tarku- 'dance.' (67).

tarna- 'send, let in,' etc.

Imp. 2 pl. *tar-na-at-ten*, C II [3], 34.

tar-na-at-te-en, D I 22.

tarrijašha- 'weariness.'

81.

N. sg. *tar-ri-ja-aš-ha-aš*, C I 48.

taruešk- 'dance.'

(67).

-ta- 'thy.'

D.-1. sg. *-ti*, B I 11.

dašk- (dur.-dist. of *da-*) 'take.'

Pres. 2 sg. *da-aš-ki-ši*, C I 40.

taššanu- 'make strong, build strongly.'

57.

Ptc. n.-a. sg. neut. *ta-aš-ša-nu-ya-an*, C I 7.

ta-aš-nu-ya-an, B I 16.

da-aš-ša-nu-ya-an, A I 20.

TAZIMTU (1) 'complaint'; (2) 'desire, prayer' (?).

51.

tekan 'earth.'

G. sg. *ták-na-aš*, C I [36], 43.

tepnušk- 'make small, bring into contempt,' varies with *tešanu-* (107 f.).

Pres. 2 sg. *te-ip-nu-uš-ki-ši*, D II 9.

tešanu- 'make small' (= *tepnu-*).

107 f.

Pres. 2 sg. *te-ip-ša-nu-ši*, C II 53.

teši, a season when it thunders.

121.

TI (= Hitt. *ḫyešnu-*) 'cause to live.'

Ptc. n.-a. sg. neut. *TI-an*, A III 4 (with *ḫark*, forming periphrastic perfect imp. 2 sg., 71).

tija- 'go.'

Pres. 3 sg. *ti-ja-az-zi*, A II 19.

anda tija-

(41).

DINGIR 'god,' Hitt. *šiu(ni)-*.

N. sg. DINGIR-*uš*, B I 3 (44).

DINGIR-*LIM-iš*, A I 3, III 3 (?); B I 15; C I 29, 45.

DINGIR-*LUM*, B I 14; C I 33, 39, II 52.

DINGIR-*LIM(-IA)*, B I 15.

A. sg. DINGIR-*LAM*, B I 2, 6.

G. sg. DINGIR-*LIM*, C II 6, [7].

D. sg. *ANA DINGIR-LIM*, B I 1.

- N.-a. pl. DINGIR.MEŠ, C II 3, 16, 19, 24, 47, 58 ; D I 18, II 20.
 G. pl. ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ, C II 9.
 D. pl. ANA DINGIR.MEŠ, A III 20 ; C II [1], 14, 31, 54, III 41 ; D II 10.
 DINGIR.MEŠ-aš, B I 8, C I 31 bis, 49 ; D I 20.
 DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš, C I 50, 52, II 55 ; D II 10.
- DINGIR.MEŠ ABI ' gods of the father ' (?). 80².
 DINGIR.MEŠ-niānza ' man of god, ecstatic ' (?). 89.
 N. sg. DINGIR.MEŠ-ni-ia-an-za, C II 20.
 DINGIR.(MEŠ/-LIM)-tar ' divinity.' (61).
 N.-a. sg. DINGIR-LIM-ia-tar, C I 21, 30.
 DINGIR.MEŠ-tar, A II 9.
- GIŠTIR ' forest, grove.'
 Sg. GIŠTIR, B II 8.
 Pl. GIŠTIR.MEŠ, C III 5.
- TI-tar (= Hitt. *ḫyešqatar*) ' life.'
 N.-a. sg. TI-tar, A III [5] ; B II 12 ; C III 18.
tittanušk- (dur.-dist. of *tittanu-* 'stand, place') ; *šarā tittanu-*
 ' accomplish,' with sup. 2. 62 ff.
 Pres. 3 pl. *šarā ti-it-ta-nu-uš-kán-zi*, C I 25.
- GIŠTUKUL (= Hitt. *ḫatanti-*). (72).
 A. sg. D.GIŠTUKUL-in, A III 14.
- tummantiā-*, meaning unknown. (72).
 A. sg. *tu-um-ma-an-ti-ia-an*, A III 10.
- DUMU LUGAL ' prince.'
 Pl. DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL, A II 11, III 1 (?), 4 (?) ; B II 12.
- DUMU.LŪ.GĀLLU ' man.'
 N. sg. DUMU.LŪ.GĀLLU, C II 22.
 G. sg. DUMU.LŪ.GĀLLU-aš, A IV 14.
 (ŠA) DUMU.LŪ.GĀLLU, A III 12.
 D. sg. ANA DUMU.LŪ.GĀLLU, D I 8.
- tuppi-* (DUPPU) ' tablet.'
 N.-a. *tup-pi*, B I 1 ; C IV 8.
 G. sg. *tup-pi-ia-aš*, C IV 2.
 DUP-I-PU, A IV 19 (117 f.).

DUP.SAR 'scribe.'

DUP.SAR, B I 1.

LÜDUP.SAR, A IV 19.

turiṣa- 'harness.'

Imp. 2 pl. *tu-(u-)ri-ṣa-at-ten*, C II 37, D I 24.

dušgarat- 'joy.'

71 f.

A. sg. *du-uš-ga-ra-at-ta-an*, B II 13, C III [19].

du-uš-ga-ra-da-an, A III 7.

duddušk- 'control' (?).

75 f.

Pres. 2 sg. *du-ud-du-uš-ki-ši*, C I 36.

U

Ū 'and'; possibly representing Hitt. *-a* 'also.'

57.

A II 11 (?), III [2], 20; B I 16, II 12; C II [1], 33, 40,

III 15, [16].

UL (= Hitt. *natta*) 'not.'

Ū-UL, A I 24, 27, II 7, 19; B I 17; C I 34, II 5, [7], 8,

10, 29, 55.

UL, A III 20.

UZU_{ula-} (= (UZU)_{ula-} ?).

43¹.

UNUTU 'utensil.'

Construct Ū-NU-UT, B II [6].

Do. dat. ANA Ū-NU-UT, A II 18.

Pl. Ū-NU-TE^{MEŠ}, A II 17; C III 2.

unuṣa- 'adorn.'

Ptc. n.-a. pl. *u-nu-ṣa-an-ta*, B I 21 (?).

UR.MAH 'lion.'

C II 45.

URU 'city' (also determinative).

URUKI, C II 57.

URU-LUM, D II 12.

ušk-, dur.-dist. of *au-* 'see.'

Pres. 2 pl. *uš-ka-at-te-ni*, D I 10.

UD 'day' (Hitt. *šiyat-*).

UD-at UD-at 'day by day,' B I 1.

UD-MI, A III 5 (see also EGIR).

UD VII.KAM, C IV 4, 5.

UD.KAM-*tī-lī* 'daily.'

A IV 21.

udne 'land,' idg. KUR.

G. sg. KUR-*e-aš*, C I 46, II 47.

D.-l. sg. *ud-ni-e*, A I 20, 24, 27 (?).

KUR-*e*, B I 17 [20]; C II 35; D II 3, 18; KUR.URU
for KUR-*e*, A II 7.

INA KUR, B I 9 (*LÚKÚR*).

N.-a. pl. KUR.KUR, A III 14 (*LÚKÚR*).

KUR.KUR.MEŠ/ĤIA/TIM, B II 3; C II 34; D I 16,
23, 25, II 7.

KUR.KUR.ĤIA-TIM, C II 38, 41.

D.-l. pl. *ud-ne-ia-aš*, D II 15 (?).

KUR.KUR.MEŠ-*aš*, C I 37 (?).

KUR.KUR.ĤIA-š(a), C I 45.

ANA KUR.KUR.ĤIA, B II 11 (?) (*LÚKÚR*);
C III 11 (do.)

ANA KUR.KUR.ĤIA-TIM, C II 45.

udniānt- 'land, country.'

N. pl. *ud-ne-(e)-an-te-eš*, C II 49 (?), D II 7.

uddar 'word, matter.'

D.-l. sg. *ud-da-ni*, C II [16].

N.-a. pl. *ud-da-a-ar*, D II 22.

UDU 'sheep.'

G. sg. UDU-*aš*, C III 27.

(ŠA) UDU, A III 11.

N. pl. UDU.ĤIA, C II 11.

G. pl. UDU.ĤIA-*aš*, B II 14.

uṣai uḍa- 'be troublesome to' (?)

(73, 74).

U

-*ya*, encl. particle indicating *oratio recta*.

B I 5.

uā/e- 'come.'

Pres. 3 sg. *ú-iz-zi*, C II 14.

2 pl. *ú-ya-(a)-at-te-ni*, C II 16, D I 6.

Imp. 3 sg. *ú-id-du*, C II 20.

- ʏaḥ-, ʏeḥ- 'turn'; as an activity in the mountains 'hunt' (?). 52.
 Inf. ʏa-ḥa-an-na, B I 9.
- ʏaḥanniḡa- (intensive stem from ʏaḥ- 'strike,' idg. GUL) 'smite,
 attack.' (106 f.).
 Sup. 1 ʏa-al-ḥa-an-ni-u-ʏa-an, D II 8.
 GUL-ḥa-an-ni-ḡa-u-ʏa-an, C II 43.
- Dur.-dist. sup. 1 ʏa-al-ḥa-an-ni-eš-ki-u-ʏa-an, C II 50.
- ʏalla- 'thigh' (?). 43.
- ʏallanu- 'treat violently' (?). (44).
- ʏallešk- (dur.-dist. of ʏalla-) 'praise, boast.' 42 ff.
- Pres. 3 sg. ʏa-al-li-iš-ki-iz-zi, B I 2.
- ʏallušk-, meaning doubtful. (44).
- ʏarnu- 'burn' (trans.); arḥa ʏarnu- 'burn up.'
 Sup. 2 arḥa ʏa-ar-nu-um-ma-an-zi, A III 22.
- ʏarš- ('stroke') 'reap.' 85².
 Pres. 3 pl. ʏa-ar-aš-ša-an-zi, C II 8.
- ʏarš(i)ant- (ptc. of ʏarš-) 'soothed, rested.' (100).
 A. sg. ʏa-ar-ši-ḡa-an-da-an, C II 36.
 N.-a. pl. neut. ʏa-ar-ša-an-da, C II 34.
 ʏa-ar-ši-ḡa-an-da, D I 23.
- ʏaršula- 'appeasement, refreshment.' 53.
 N. sg. ʏa-ar-šu-la-aš, B I 10.
- ʏaštul 'sin.'
 N.-a. sg. ʏa-aš-du-ul, D I 10.
 D.-l. sg. ʏa-aš-du-li, C II 17.
- ʏatarnah- 'order, commend,' with anda. (41).
- ʏeriḡa- 'speak'; with anda 'have intimate conversations with.' (41).
- ʏeš 'we.'
 Gen. an-zi-el, B I 6.
- ʏešuriḡa- 'oppress.'
 Ptc. n. sg. ʏe-e-šu-ri-ḡa-an-za, C III 14.
- ʏiḡa- 'send' (arḥa 'away').
 Pret. 3 sg. u-i-ḡa-at, B I 4.
 3 pl. u-i-e-ir, B I 5.
- Imp. 2 sg. u-i-ḡa, A III [17] (arḥa).
- ʏiḡa- 'entice.' (48).

Z

-za, encl. particle with reflexive force ; see also -zan.

-za, A IV 19 ; B I 7, 9, 15, II [7], 9 ; C I 29, 31, 45, 46, 49,
54, II 28, 52, III 4, 6, 12.

-z, B II 5 ; C I 32, 34, 43, 47.

zaḥai- 'battle.'

D.-1. sg. za-aḥ-ḥi-ia, B I 9.

Inst. za-aḥ-ḥa-it, D II 3 (?).

ZAG 'boundary.'

A. pl. ZAG.ḪI.A-uš, C I 37.

ZAG.DIB 'thigh' (= Hitt. yalla-?).

43.

-zan, contraction for -za-šan, D I 18.

96.

zašḥai- 'dream.'

Abl. sg. za-aš-ḥi/ḥe-ia-az, C II 22, D I 12.

zenant- 'autumn.'

G. sg. zé-na-an-da-aš, A II 5.

ZI 'soul, self, person.'

Dat. ANA ZI(-ŠU-NU), A III 6.

zik 'thou.'

Nom. zi-ik, B I 3, 15 ; C I 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39 bis,
40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 54.

Gen. tu-(e-)el, B I 4, 5 ; C I 21 (= A II 9), 23, II 52 ; D II 9
(text tu-el-e).

Dat. tu-uk, B II 4 ; C I 41, 53, 56.

zikila 'thou thyself.'

Nom. zi-ki-la, C III 12.

zik-, dur.-dist. of dai- 'put.'

Pres. 2 sg. zi-ik-ki-ši, C I 37, 51, 52.

Pret. 3 sg. zi-ik-ki-i-it, D II 6.

3 pl. zi-ik-ki-ir, C II 48.

Imp. 2 sg. zi-ik-ki, A III [8], 15.

NUMERALS

I (Accad. *IŠTEN*).*I-EN*, C II 57 *bis*, 58; D II 13.Acc. *I-an*, C II 59.*DUP-I-PU*, A IV 19.VII, see *s.v.* UD.

2. NAMES

DIVINE

DINNINNI-i-, dwells in Nineveh. (118).*DNanaia-*, dwells in Kissina. (118).*DSIN*, the Moon-god, dwells in Kuzina. (118).*DTelipinu-*, known elsewhere as a god of fertility and vegetation,
not as a Sun-god. 8, 10.Nom. *DTe-li-pi-nu-uš*, A II 20, III 3; B I 3, 7, 15.Acc. *DTe-li-pi-nu-un*, B I 5.Gen. *ŠA DTe-li-pi-nu*, A II 9; C I 23.Dat. *ANA DTe-li-pi-ni*, A III 19 (111).(PANI) *DTe-li-pi-nu*, A IV 20.

DU, see DX.

DUTU, the Sun-god Šamaš, dwells in Sippar. (118).*DUTU-uš*, the Hittite Sun-god, takes the place of Sun-goddess
of Arinna in certain texts. 10 f., 83.*DUTU URUArinna* 'Sun-goddess of Arinna,' patroness of the
Hittite state. 9.

Was there a Sun-god of Arinna? 11.

DUTU URUA-ri-in-na, C I 21, 29, 32, 33, 39, 42, 44, 51, [55],

57, 58, II 44, 48, III 10, 12, 35 (?), IV 3.

ANA DUTU URUA-ri-in-na, C I 41, 56, II 1, 42, 51.*URUA-ri-in-n[a-aš IŠ-TU DUTU]*, D II 2.*DUTU-ŠI* (Accad. *ŠAMŠI*) 'my sun,' title of Hittite king.

D II 19.

DX (*i.e.* DU), the Weather-god, dwells in Kummiya. (118).

PERSONAL

¹*Muršili*-, the Hittite king.

Nom. ¹*Mur-ši*-DINGIR-*LIM-iš*, C I 22.

¹*Mur-ši-i-lī*, A II 10 (?), B I 4.

Dat. *ANA* ¹*Mur-ši-i-lī*, C III [15].

¹*Zuṣā* (?), name of scribe (?).

119.

. . .]zu-u-*u*[a . . ., D II 23.

GEOGRAPHICAL

Araṣanna, land.

102.

KUR URU*A-ra-u-ya-an-na*, C II 40.

Arinna, city.

Loc. URU*A-ri-in-ni*, D II 21.

INA URU*A-ri-in-na*, C IV 5.

Arzaya, land.

KUR URU*Ar-za-u-ya*, D I 17.

D.-1. *ANA* KUR URU*Ar-za-u-ya*, C II 33.

Halpa, city (= Aleppo).

(106).

Acc. URU*H-a-al-pa-an*, C II 46.

Hatti, land, idg. KUBABBAR 'silver' (see Sommer, *IF* LV 172-4).

KUR URU*H-a-at-ti*, A I 26, II 2, 6, [12], III 16; B I 16, 18;

C I 21, II 43, III 36; D I 14, 19, 23, II 2, 14, 16, 17.

KUR URU*H-at-ti*, A I 19, 22, IV 17.

KUR URUKUBABBAR-*ti*, B II 18; C I 7, 15, 18, 23, II 4,

35, 44, 50, 59.

Gen. *ŠA* KUR URU*H-a-at-ti*, C II 38.

(DINGIR.MEŠ) URU*H-a-at-ti*, A III 20.

Dat. *ANA* KUR URU*H-a-at-ti*, A III [2]; B II 12; C III 16,

[17], 36 (?).

ANA KUR URUKUBABBAR-*ti*, C II 24.

Hattuša-, city (= Boğazköy), idg. KUBABBAR 'silver' (see Sommer, *IF* LV 172-4).

Loc. URUKUBABBAR-*ši*, C IV 4; D II [20].

Kalašma, *Kalašpa*, land.

13, 102.

KUR URUKa-*la-aš-ma*, C II 40.

KUR URUKa-*la-a-aš-pa*, D I 27.

- Gašga, Kaška*, land. 101, 102.
 KUR URUGa-aš-ga, C II 38.
 KUR URUKa-a-aš-ka, D I 25.
- KĀ.DINGIR.RA, Babylon. (106).
 Acc. URUKĀ.DINGIR.RA-an, C II 46.
 Habitation of Marduk. (118).
- Kiššina*, habitation of Nanaia. (118).
- Kizzuyatna*, land. 13, 96.
 Nom. KUR URUKi-iz-zu-ya-at-ni, D I 17.
 D.-1. [ANA] KUR URUKi-iz-zu-ya-at-ni, D I 22.
- Kummiya*, habitation of Weather-god. (118).
- Kuzina*, habitation of Moon-god. (118).
- Laggā, Lukka*, land. (13), 102.
 KUR URULu-ug-ga-a, D I 27.
 KUR URULu-uk-ka, C II 40.
- Mittanni*, land, varies with *hurlaš* KUR-e 'land of the Hurrians,'
q.v. 93 f.
 KUR URUMi-it-ta-an-ni, C II 27.
 D.-1. ANA KUR URUMi-it-ta-an-ni, C II 33.
- Nerik*, city.
 Loc. URUNe-ri-ik-ki (?), D II [21].
- Pitašša*, land. (13), 103.
 KUR URUPi-(i)-ta-aš-ša, C II 41, D I 27.
- Sippar*, habitation of Sun-god. (118).
- Zippalanda*, city.
 URUZi[-ip-pa-la-an-ti (?)], D II 21.

3. PASSAGES TREATED

<i>Bab.</i> IV	224 rev. 5	(111)	III 7 I 12	48-9
<i>Bo.</i>	260 rev. 3	67	8 III 11, 13	(104 n. 2)
	681 4 f.	114	16 rev. 10, 13	(49 n. 2)
	694 rev. 1 ff.	(66)	IV 4 II 40 ff.	(94)
	703 obv. 9	91	12 obv. 7	(100)
	706 rev. 21, 27	(115)	13 VI 10	(45 n. 1)
	712 obv. 2-10	69	V 2 I 31 ff.	(91)
	1224 I 8 f.	(91)	VI 34 II 31	(108)
	2073 I 36, II 48	73	34 III 36-38	69
	2379	(82)	<i>KUB</i> II 5 I 2-3	114
	2660 I 5-11	69	13 VI 22-3	80 n. 2
	2721 II 10 f.	(44 n. 3)	III 99 II 10	(71)
	2805	61	100 9	71
	2819 II 4-6	65	103 5	45, 51
	3162 II 9	(65)	IV 1 I 17 f.	(42)
	5810 obv. 4 ff.	(114)	1 I 22 f.	99
/b	58/b obv. I 8-11	68 f.	1 III 5 ff.	66
	804/b	(83)	3 obv. 12 ff.	87
/c	78/c	(83)	V 1 I 8, 11	(78 n. 1)
/f	520/f 6, 9	(80 n. 2)	1 III 23, 28	(78 n. 1)
	531/f II 11	107	VII 5, see IX 27	
2 <i>BoTU</i>	12A II 12	108	8 „ „	
<i>CH</i>	§§ 57-92	(101-2)	10 I 6	(90)
	§ 126	(90)	60 II 19 f.	(42)
<i>Hatt.</i>	III 6 f.	(41)	VIII 1 III 3	112
	IV 21	100 n. 1	6 II 11	107
<i>Hukk.</i>	I 27	(41)	IX 27	48
<i>HT</i>	1 I 38-45	64	28 I 14	(64 n. 5)
<i>KBo.</i>	I 35 1-2	(71)	X 11 V 1-4	123
	II 3 II 32	(74)	91 III 10	(42)
	8 I 26	(100)	92 V 10	(80 n. 2)
	8 I 30, IV 1	67	92 V 11-15	90
	9	46-7	XI 21 V 17-20	123
	36	46-7	XII 2 IV 2-3	(121 n. 10)

KUB XII (continued)—

18 I 3	(65)
63 obv. 9	(100)
XIII 4 IV 56 ff.	86-7
7 I 17-18	73
9 IV 11	(119)
35 II 28-37	97
XIV 15 IV 24	(41)
XV 3 I 7 ff.	63
11 II 5-7	122 n. 6
11 II 10-11	(122)
31 and 32	47
34	47
34 I 34	48 n. 1
34 II 32	53
35	46-7
XVI 53 obv. 9	(86)
76 11	114
XVII 10 II 26-7	(114)
10 III 6-7	(74)
10 III 17	108
10 IV 2	(111)
14 I 16	(80 n. 2)
20 II 9	(72)
20 II 22	90
23 I 1	50
28 I 14-16	90 with n. 2
35 III 8, 35	(55 n. 4)
XIX 37 II 1 ff.	(43 n. 3)
39 III 10	(96 n. 1)
XX 1 II 33	50
4 I 8	(44 n. 3)
59 I 17	(64 n. 5)
92 VI 10 f.	110
XXI 27 IV 38-42	100
XXIII 77 65-67	49
77 79	(44 n. 1)

XXIV 7 IV 39	(90)
8 I 26	(44 n. 3)
8 IV 13-20	118
9 III 14+10 III 7	
+11 III 5	(100 n. 1)
14 I 7-8	91 n. 2
XXV 23 IV 61	(111)
24 II 4	67
37 IV 16 ff.	(66)
XXVI 1 III 41-3	73
1 III 49+8 III 11	(41)
32 I 14-15	73
XXVII 1 I 20-22	(59)
1 III 18	(42)
16 III 14	50
49 III 17 f.	(90)
49 IV 7	(65)
60 13	67
66 II 13	67
66 III 17	(90 n. 1)
68 I 1-2	58
69 I 16-17	67
XXVIII 6 obv. 12b	(105)
XXIX 1 II 2-3	81 n. 4
1 III 43-4	(90), 104
4 I 6-8, 12	63
4 III 33	118
7 rev. 20-21	85 n. 2
7 rev. 21-22	104-5
VBoT 1 36	91
16 rev. 7	(82)
24 III 4 ff.	60 f.
24 III 14-42	90 f.
58 (IV 8 ff.)	50
58 IV 20	(64 n. 5)
116 13	65
Gray, Šamaš, 1 I 13-15	84

REVIEWS

The Common People of Pompeii. A Study of the Graffiti. By HELEN H. TANZER. The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 29. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1939.

This is a pleasing little book which ought to have a general appeal, since it deals with the human interests that can be disinterred from the ashes of Vesuvius; not with the dry details of town-planning, architecture, or the art of house decoration, but with the way the common people lived and carried on their businesses or enjoyed their leisure. The illustrations are numerous and well chosen, and rightly include some reproductions of the cursive script used for most of the graffiti that are the subject of study. Two illustrations in particular, Fig. 27, the 'chucker-out,' and Fig. 47, a quarrel over dice, show that the dwellers in Pompeii were very human, and that we are wrong if we think of them as fit occupants of a museum show-case.

J. P. DROOP.

A Political History of Parthia. By NELSON C. DEBEVOISE. The University of Chicago Press. The Cambridge University Press, 1938. 13s. 6d. net.

The difficulties inherent in the task of writing the political history of an empire for which hardly any internal evidence exists, except a series of coins which though dated seldom bear the king's name, might well have daunted a less zealous writer than Mr. Debevoise. That he has made so successful an attempt says much for his industry in marshalling the scattered evidence and his skill in assessing its widely differing values. To compress the story of five hundred years, even though little be known about them except the names of the rulers, into three hundred pages necessarily means that those names chase one another so closely that it is no disparagement to the author to say that to grasp the thread of the narrative is not always easy, and that the most interesting part of the book is the introduction, in which it is possible to get away from the trees and see the wood. Here the author draws a striking but unexplained parallel between the feudatory system of the Parthian Empire, going down from the King of Kings through the nobles and merchants to the peasant tilling the soil, and that of the Middle Ages in Europe; and he might have added a similar parallel between the Parthian military system and the Mediaeval, both resting on the value of the mounted men-at-arms, though perhaps less interest attaches to that as there may well have been an historical connection through the development of the later Roman armies.

J. P. DROOP.

The Lachish Letters. The Wellcome Archaeological Research Expedition to the Near East. Oxford Univ. Press. 25s.

The discovery of 18 ostraca at Tell-ed-Duweir in 1935 by the late J. L. Starkey has proved to be one of the most informative finds in the whole history of Palestinian archaeology. As the remains of a correspondence in Hebrew strikingly similar to that of the Old Testament, the material is unique. The script, though showing cursive adaptations, is substantially the same as the Old Phoenician. Separator dots are usually found between the words, a usage that tends to confirm our surmise from the Massoretic notes that this must also have been the practice of the scribes of the Old Testament.

In this volume, the official publication of the expedition, Professor Torczyner gives us a translation of the documents with the addition of a commentary. On the basis of his translation he propounds the theory that we have here the correspondence between Hosha'yahu, the commander of a small outpost to the north of Lachish, and Ya'ush, military governor of Lachish. As the letters were found in a room near the gate of the city, and all those written by Hosha'yahu (fourteen or more) are of an exonerating character, it is highly probable in the Editor's view that they represent Hosha'yahu's dossier at his court martial. The letters II, III, VI, XII and XVI deal with the part he is accused of having played in the tragic fate of the prophet Uriahu.

It is evident on a closer examination of the photographs of the originals that the translation, ingenuous as it often is, is nevertheless only tentative, and it is unfortunate that Professor Torczyner has proceeded to the exegesis of the texts without awaiting a thorough philological study of the material. Before this can be properly carried out better photographs of some of the letters will be required.

W. J. MARTIN.

The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit. By CLAUDE F. A. SCHAEFFER. Schweich Lectures published for the British Academy by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1939. 8s. 6d.

In these lectures Professor Schaeffer gives us within the brief compass of some 80 pages the main conclusions to be drawn from the finds made at the site of Ugarit as to the history and culture of the Near East. Previously Ugarit was to us little more than a name mentioned in Egyptian inscriptions and in the Tell el Amarna letters, now we know it as a flourishing port carrying on an extensive trade with Egypt and Palestine and its citizens as men of no mean cultural attainment.

Many of the finds witness to the high development of the arts and crafts. Work in the precious metals was widely cultivated. A number of weights used by jewellers was found. There was a system of weights

based on the mina divided into fifty shekels, as well as a system later used by the Israelites.

The discovery that attracted most attention was that of clay tablets bearing an unknown cuneiform script, composed of twenty-nine signs—a clear indication of its alphabetic character. From the fact that some of these documents date from as early as the fifteenth century we must infer that long before this time writing was known to the Canaanites. The language of these texts is archaic Hebrew, and from them we learn much about the history and religion of the Phoenicians.

The discoveries have thrown a flood of new light on the background of the Old Testament, and Old Testament scholars will welcome this masterly résumé of the material. W. J. MARTIN.

Temples of Armant : a Preliminary Survey. By Sir ROBERT MOND and OLIVER H. MYERS; with Chapters by M. S. DROWER, D. B. HARDEN, S. A. HUZAYYIN, R. E. McEWEN and MARY I. C. MYERS. Vol. I, text, pp. xii+223. Vol. II, pp. vi+Pls. 107. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1940. £2, 10s.

This publication is especially deserving of commendation in view of the circumstances attending its production—the tragic death of Sir Robert Mond and the outbreak of the European War. Despite these grave disadvantages, Mr. Myers and his colleagues have compiled a work in which the material obtained during the excavations of the sites of the temples of Hermonthis is dealt with as thoroughly and systematically as the material which has formed the subject of any previous volumes of this series.

The opening chapter consists of a good summary of the long history of Armant, which even before the Eleventh Dynasty was evidently a place of importance and wealth. Apparently a temple of some kind was already in existence there in the Archaic Period (p. 29), and it was not till after the thirteenth, perhaps as late as the sixteenth, century A.D. that the town fell into real decay.

It is a pity that so little light has been thrown on the cult of Buchis by the excavation of the late Roman Wall (p. 10), to construct which the great Ptolemaic temple of Armant was demolished in order to supply the building material. But alas! this wall was destroyed in the middle of the last century and the inscribed and sculptured blocks of stone broken up and used to form the foundations of the houses of the modern town. 'With this,' as Mr. Myers remarks, 'have probably gone the last hopes of tracing the life history (as opposed to the funerary record) of Buchis.'

Very fine reliefs belonging to the Eleventh-Dynasty temple of Mentu have been recovered from the foundations of the destroyed Ptolemaic temple, reliefs which in delicacy of technique compare favourably with the best examples of the Old Kingdom (see Pls. LXXXVIII and XCIV ff.).

Of outstanding interest is the relief, still *in situ* on the pylon (pp. 24 f. and 159 f.), depicting a procession of negroes bringing tribute and headed by a captive rhinoceros, the dimensions of which are given beside it. The reviewer finds it hard to believe that this relief is contemporary with Tuthmosis III. Its style, the phraseology of the accompanying inscription, and the occurrence of *Pr-¹* with the meaning 'Pharaoh,' all suggest the reign of Ramesses II (p. 160).

An exceptionally fine piece of New Kingdom sculpture is the fragment displaying heads of prisoners (pp. 23 f. and 75; Pl. LXXXVII). Mr. Myers (p. 23) gives a useful account of how the colouring of this relief was preserved. It might here, too, be pointed out that archaeologists will find equally useful what the same authority has to say about the cleaning of the pylon reliefs (pp. 24 f.), and about the preservation both of the disintegrating fragments of a statue (p. 53) and of decayed millefiori glass (pp. 119 f.).

An interesting discovery are the Osirid statues bearing the name of King Merenptah (Pls. XV ff.; pp. 50 and 158). In the reviewer's opinion there is much to be said for the view that they are statues of a Mentuhotep usurped by the above-mentioned Nineteenth-Dynasty monarch. Surely, as one authority has suggested, the fine diorite head of a king (Pl. XX, 1) is a product of the Ptolemaic period (see p. 51).

Worthy of note is the fragment of a Twelfth-Dynasty hexad (Pl. XX), the earliest example hitherto known, and that complete, dating from the Eighteenth Dynasty. The foundation deposits of Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III are, apart from their historic significance, quite pleasing, especially the inscribed models of metal tools (Pls. XXIX ff., and XL).

Archaeologists will find Mr. S. A. Huzayyin's chapter on the flint implements instructive, especially the statement (p. 73), 'Students of flints are often tempted to attribute rough tools and artefacts to earlier times alone. The possibility of the survival of certain elements and aspects of Predynastic technique into historic times is also often overlooked.' A similar remark was made by Dr. G. A. Reisner to the reviewer as long ago as 1908!

What Mr. Myers has to say on the subject of Graeco-Roman and Coptic pottery will be most useful to all who are interested in Roman and Christian Egypt. Particularly valuable are Pls. LIV-LXV, which supplement the Graeco-Roman-Coptic Corpus in *Bucheum* III, and Pls. LXXXII and LXXXIII (coloured), the work of Mrs. Myers, illustrating late Roman and Coptic pottery decoration. It is satisfactory to read (p. 80) that much of this late pottery can now be dated with more certainty than was possible a few years ago. What Mr. Myers says (p. 95) about the relationship of the 'unrestrained and flamboyant animals,' which so often appear on Coptic pottery, to the designs on the glazed ware from Fustât, seems a very happy suggestion. It will be interesting to see if further research confirms his belief, resulting, apparently, from the excavations at Armant, that *Terra Sigillata* ware 'arrived very late in Upper Egypt, certainly after the fourth century' (p. 97).

The philologist and student of the Egyptian religion will find some valuable material in the inscriptions (pp. 157 ff.), admirably translated and discussed by Miss M. S. Drower. She has some interesting things to say about the goddesses *Tnnt*, *'Iwnyt* and *R'yt-l'wy* (pp. 158 f.) and about the cult of Mentu and Buchis. A Twelfth-Dynasty inscription here published contains the earliest mention of Mentu in his taurine aspect, and the epithet 'Bull of Hermonthis who came forth from et-Tūd' suggests that it was in that town that this particular bull-cult originated. Perhaps more light will be thrown on the origin of this cult and of the bull's connection with Mentu when the rest of the sculptured and inscribed blocks of the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties are extracted from the foundations of the Ptolemaic temple (p. 166).

With the writing of the name of the hawk-god of *Nhn* (Pl. XCIV, 2) cf. Tylor-Griffith, *Tomb of Pakheri*, Pl. I; see also Sethe, *Urgeschichte*, § 189.

One would like to know why in two instances (p. 163) the Sed-festival of Ramesses II was proclaimed on the *seventeenth* of the first month of Prōyet, while in other instances both at Armant and Gebel Silsileh (p. 164) that festival was proclaimed, as one might well expect (see *JEA*, 2, pp. 128 f.; Sethe, *Untersuchungen*, III, pp. 135 f.), on the *first* day of the above-mentioned month. By the way, the interpretation of the word *sr* (p. 164) employed in this connection is undoubtedly correct.

TUTHMOSIS III STELA.

l. 2. Can *m sp mnḥ n prt-(ḥ)t-(ḥr ht tpyt*¹ be translated: 'being every fine deed of prowess, beginning with the first generation'? This rendering gives good sense and means that in Tuthmosis' deeds of prowess are exemplified all those that have been performed by man since his first appearance on the earth. However, I am doubtful if *ḥ)t-(ḥr* can mean 'beginning with.'

l. 3. Does not *n ḥḥw m rnpwt iwtysn* mean: 'to millions in the years to come'?

ll. 4-5. Should not *d)n-f sw dī-f pr šsp 3 ḥr-s)f* be rendered: 'it (the arrow) had penetrated it (the target) protruding to the extent of three cubits behind it,' lit. 'it had penetrated it causing three cubits to protrude behind it'?

l. 7. I would suggest for *ḥpr-n sty-r ḥbsywt iry n phwy-fy* the rendering: 'By breakfast-time their tails were (a spoil) for his hinder parts,' which fits in also with what is said in n. c.

The volume concludes with a number of technical reports which archaeologists will doubtless find instructive. The photographic and outline plates are admirable and the value of the publication is considerably enhanced by the excellent indexes.

A. M. BLACKMAN.

1. Not *ht tpyw* as Miss Drower transcribes, p. 184, n. c.

Excavations at Saggara, 1937-1938: Hor-Aha. By WALTER B. EMERY, M.A., with the collaboration of ZAKI YUSEF SAAD. Pp. viii+112, pls. 24. Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Cairo, Government Press, Bulâq, 1939.

Most Egyptologists after reading the first chapter of this volume will probably feel there is much to be said for the author's view that Tomb No. 3357 at Sakkārah is the actual burial-place of Hor-'Aha, while that known as B. No. 19 at Abydos is a cenotaph. The evidence, as Mr. Emery admits, is not conclusive, but it certainly favours that suggestion, especially if Hor-'Aha is to be identified with Menes, who, according to tradition, was the founder of Memphis, of which city Sakkārah is the necropolis. But is Hor-'Aha so to be identified? The *Naqadah Tablet*, as drawn by Mr. Emery, and the occurrence of the *Mn*-sign on the back of the Hor-'Aha tablet from Abydos certainly favour that proposal. At any rate Vikentieff's recent suggestion (p. 5), that the *Nbtj-Mn* group on the former tablet represents the chairs and pavilions of the Sed-festival, is surely to be ruled out.

The author is probably correct in regarding s) *St* (son of Isis) as a title or attribute, rather than as a name (p. 5), but whether *Ht*- is so to be regarded and likewise *Mn* on the seal of Narmer is more problematical.

The discovery (pp. 8 f.) of the grave or brick casing of a wooden solar bark beside the tomb of Hor-'Aha is of great importance, for it clearly shows that the close association of the Egyptian king with the sun-god was already a well-established feature of the state religion. Sethe was therefore probably correct in his view that this association dates back to pre-dynastic times.

The most important objects found in the tomb, which has alas! been grievously plundered, are the clay jar-sealings (pp. 19 ff.). Of them the most striking, perhaps, is No. 16 (p. 29), displaying a lioness, with three bent rods on her back, crouching in front of a trellis-work shrine, which is clearly the Upper-Egyptian *pr-wr*. That the fork-like objects and the circles have any connection with *psš-kf* bread seems hardly likely. Is not de Morgan's suggestion (p. 30) more probable, the circles representing the beds in which the trees are planted? In the reviewer's opinion, Mr. Emery's reading of the signs on sealing No. 12 (p. 27) is highly dubious and the suggested translation impossible. He himself does not, however, venture to offer an alternative reading or rendering!

The chapters on the stone and pottery vessels (pp. 34 ff., 68 ff.) contain a lot of useful data and are well illustrated with drawings and photographs. The pottery models of rhinoceros horns (p. 71) are most intriguing. Did they once contain perfume? In this connection it might be pointed out that civet is to this day exported from Abyssinia to this country in horns, the open ends of which, as in the case of pickle-jars, are covered with a piece of parchment or leather tied on with string.

Very instructive are Appendix IV, the collection of hieroglyphic signs found on the monuments of Hor-'Aha, and the dockets on the pottery vessels reproduced on Pls. 20-24. The latter definitely show that the Egyptian scribes were already at the very beginning of the First Dynasty employing a script that could be written rapidly with ink and reed-brush (see *Annals*, XXV, p. 141). Unfortunately there is considerable doubt as to how many of the signs composing these dockets are to be transcribed, and even greater doubt as to how they are to be interpreted (pp. 74 ff.). The late Professor Sethe might possibly have been able to shed some light on the darkness!

Mr. Emery's plans and architectural drawings are, as usual, beautifully executed, and his photographs, as they were not in the *Tomb of Hemaka*, are really well reproduced. By the way, on p. 2, l. 27, read 'This' for 'this'; note also that the misplaced plate immediately preceding Pl. 20 should evidently be numbered 24. An index would have been a good ending to a fine piece of work.

A. M. BLACKMAN.

A Street in Petra. By M. A. MURRAY and J. C. ELLIS. London: British School in Archaeology in Egypt, 1940. 25s.; to subscribers, 21s.

Any attempt to shed more light on the history and culture of Petra is a commendable undertaking, and the present account of the excavation of a number of caves there brings us nearer the solution of some of our problems.

The finds consisted mainly of pottery, all of which, with the exception of some small drinking cups, is unfortunately in a fragmentary state, and a few fragments of glass vases and of Roman terracotta lamps. Of metal only a few bronze ornaments and tools and a mass of iron weighing several pounds were found. Of importance for the chronology of the site is a small bronze coin, a Gaza issue of Hadrian.

The most interesting find was that of a mould for casting a head which may be the portrait of a Nabataean Queen.

Chapter VI, dealing with the architecture of Petra, is very instructive, and while due stress is laid on the eclecticism of its style, a fuller discussion of the question of Assyrian influence would not have been out of place.

It is to be hoped that when further excavations are carried out at Petra they will be on a larger scale, and that some of the Nabataean inscriptions, of which there should be no lack in Petra, may be brought to light.

W. J. MARTIN.

